THE LIBRARY
OF
THE UNIVERSITY
OF CALIFORNIA
LOS ANGELES

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2008 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

http://www.archive.org/details/modernhagiologye02cros

MODERN HAGIOLOGY:

An Examination of

THE NATURE AND TENDENCY OF SOME LEGENDARY AND DEVOTIONAL WORKS

LATELY PUBLISHED UNDER THE SANCTION OF

THE REV. J. H. NEWMAN, THE REV. DR. PUSEY,
AND
THE REV. F. OAKELEY.

BY THE REV.

J. C. CROSTHWAITE, M.A.

RECTOR OF ST. MARY-AT-HILL, AND ST. ANDREW HUBBARD, LONDON.

VOL. II.

Whatsoever is not truth can be no part of Christian religion.—South.

LONDON:
JOHN W. PARKER, WEST STRAND.
MDCCCXLVI.

BX 1493
C88 v.2

CONTENTS

OF

VOLUME THE SECOND.

CHAPTER I.

MR. OAKELEY'S ACCOUNT OF HIS WORK.

Page

This Treatment of Scripture Sinful and Unchristian . 4
Mr. Oakeley's View of the Church 7
His Complaint of Suspicion 8

CHAPTER II.

THE SAME SUBJECT CONTINUED.

Mr. Oakeley's Ignorance of the Doctrine of Canonization 12
His Account of his Translation 14
Misapplication of Scripture 16
Hidden Meanings 17
His Defence continued 18
Visit of the Virgin to Elizabeth 19
Nativity of John the Baptist 20
The Epiphany 22

CHAPTER III.

MR. OAKELEY'S MEDITATIONS.

The Purification 27
Sinless Nature of the Virgin Mary 31

CHAPTER IV.

A DIGRESSION.

Danger of Tampering with Truth 34
Dr. Pusey's Idea of Humility 35

705269

CHAPTER V.

MR. OAKELEY'S MEDITATIONS RESUMED.

Page
Their Doctrinal Character 40
The Annunciation 41
The Ascension 43
A Meditation which Mr. Oakeley omitted 44
Mr. Oakeley's Apology 50

CHAPTER VI.

THE SINLESS PERFECTION OF THE VIRGIN MARY.

Mr. Oakeley's Meditation on the Purification . . . 51
Dr. Pusey's Meditation 55

CHAPTER VII.

FANATICISM.

Dr. Pusey's Adaptation of Avrillon's Guide to Passing Advent Holily 58
Prayer to the Angels 71

CHAPTER VIII.

FANATICISM.

The Progress of Error 73
Dr. Pusey's Adaptation of The Year of Affections . . 75
Jesuitical Object of this sort of Teaching 82

CHAPTER IX.

FANATICISM.

Dr. Pusey's Meditation on Inebriated Love 83
Effects of such Writing 87
Is Dr. Pusey's Notion of Piety Scriptural or True? . 89

CHAPTER X.

MORE SPECIMENS OF FANATICISM.

St. Gilbert's Nuns 91
Jesuitical Doctrine of Obedience 92

Page
Raptures and Visions 93
Inspiration 99
St. Teresa and the Bible 101

CHAPTER XI.

HUMILITY.

Dr. Pusey's Jesuitical Doctrine of Humility 103
Fanatical Doctrine of the Love of God 108

CHAPTER XII.

DR. PUSEY'S DOCTRINE CONCERNING THE VIRGIN MARY.

Preface to Avrillon's Guide to Advent 110
The Term "Mother of God" 112
Dr. Pusey's Argument and Charges examined . . . 113
The Conception of the Virgin Mary 116

CHAPTER XIII.

THE SUBJECT CONTINUED.

Further Examination of Dr. Pusey's Argument . . . 122
His Meditation on the Annunciation 124
The Object of the Fiction 126

CHAPTER XIV.

THE SUBJECT CONTINUED.

The Month of Mary 127
The Glories of Mary 128
Dr. Pusey's Defence of this Fiction 129
His Censure of the Glories of Mary in 1841 132
His Doctrine in 1845 136

CHAPTER XV.

THE SUBJECT CONTINUED.

Review of Dr. Pusey's Doctrine continued 137
Tendency to Neologianism 138
Dr. Pusey's Defence of Avrillon 140
Mr. Oakeley's Meditation of the Annunciation . . . *ib.*

Page
Dr. Pusey's Meditation of the Visit to Elizabeth . . 145
Danger of Reaction 148

CHAPTER XVI.

THE SUBJECT CONTINUED.

Dr. Pusey's Affective Paraphrases 149
The Sixth General Council 154
Another Affective Paraphrase 157

CHAPTER XVII.

MEDITATION.

Dr. Pusey's Adaptation of Avrillon's Guide to Lent . 160
His Account of his Work 163
Dr. Pusey responsible for the Doctrine of these Adaptations 168

CHAPTER XVIII.

MEDITATION.

Dr. Pusey's Defence of the Practice of Meditation . . 170
His Meditation on the Crucifixion 174
Mr. Oakeley's Meditation 177
His Meditation compared with Dr. Pusey's 178

CHAPTER XIX.

VARIOUS EXAMPLES OF DR. PUSEY'S MEDITATION.

The Washing of the Disciples' Feet 180
The Agony of Christ 182
The Sleep of the Apostles 183
Tendency of these Fictions 184
Christ before Caiaphas 187
The Scourging of Christ 189
The Crown of Thorns 191

CHAPTER XX.

MORE EXAMPLES.

The Ecce Homo 192
Christ bearing His Cross 195
The Crown of Thorns 199

CHAPTER XXI.

MORE INSTANCES.

Page
The Darkness at the Crucifixion 201
The Taking Down from the Cross 202
Mr. Oakeley's Meditation 203
Indecency of such Meditations 208
Tendency to Neologianism 209
Dr. Pusey's Prayer to Providence 210

CHAPTER XXII.

FURTHER EXAMPLES.

Dr. Pusey's Account of the Resurrection 213
His Doctrine concerning the Holy Communion . . . 215

CHAPTER XXIII.

TAMPERING WITH SCRIPTURE.

It is a Contest for Life 220
Dr. Pusey's Meditations contradict Themselves and the Evangelists 222
Tampering with Holy Scripture 225

CHAPTER XXIV.

ROMANIZINGS.

Dr. Pusey's Romanizings 228
His Suggestions for Beginners 229

CHAPTER XXV.

THE LIMBUS PATRUM.

Mr. Oakeley's Meditation 234
His Defence 236
Dr. Pusey's Meditation 238

CHAPTER XXVI.

LENT.

Dr. Pusey's Doctrine of the Divine Institution of Lent . 241
His Doctrine of Expiatory Penance 242
Summary of his Doctrine of Atonement 250

CHAPTER XXVII.

AUSTERITIES.

Page
Dr. Pusey's Recommendation of Austerities 251
His Rules for Beginners Jesuitical 252
St. Edmund of Canterbury 253
Mabel 254
St. Edmund's Vow 255
St. Edmund's Penances 256
His Prayers 257
Is this Christianity? 259

CHAPTER XXIII.

MONASTICISM.

Dr. Pusey's Panegyric of Monasticism 261
The Nuns of Watton 262
Archbishop Thurstan and the Monks of St. Mary . . 264

CHAPTER XXIX.

JESUITISM — CONCLUSION.

Dr. Pusey's Advocacy of Jesuitism—
Obedience 268
Inspiration 269
Espionage 271
Ignatius Loyola and Laynez 273
Dr. Pusey's Recommendation of the Jesuit Doctrine of
Humility 275
And Obedience 277
And Casting off Natural Affections 278
Jesuitism, the Development of the Movement . . . 280

APPENDIX.

Two Letters to the Editor of the British Magazine by
a Country Vicar 283

MODERN HAGIOLOGY.

CHAPTER I.

MR. OAKELEY'S ACCOUNT OF HIS WORK.

In the introduction to his translation of the Life of Bonaventure, Mr. Oakeley has touched on one point, which is so curious, and so curiously handled, that it appears to me to deserve a little more than a passing notice. My readers will recollect that Mr. Oakeley professes his work to be "newly translated for the use of members of the Church of England," the truth being, that it differs in several respects from the translation in use among the Roman catholics. Mr. Oakeley, however, acknowledges that what he has done amounts to something more than mere re-translation, and that the work, as he gives it, is intended to be in such a state as should give no reasonable offence to members of the Church of England. His words are as follows:—

> The Meditations now laid before the English reader have been *adapted to the presumed wants of our church* under that conflict of feelings which all who have been engaged in the same kind of task will fully appreciate; on the one hand, of a desire to omit nothing which might profit, on the other, *to retain nothing which might offend and perplex.* The same parties will also understand the extreme difficulty which besets the attempt to act upon

the latter of these wishes; offence in some quarters being the necessary condition, under actual circumstances, of edification in others. Again, it needs but little experience in such trials to know the absolute impossibility of anticipating the course, still more of obviating the tide, of objection; depending as it does upon the incalculable varieties of feeling under which books are read by an indefinite number of readers.—p. xxviii.

Now, giving Mr. Oakeley as much credit for sincerity as he can desire, does not this passage betray a most extraordinary degree of infatuation and self-delusion? What are the facts I have already laid before my readers? They are simply these: that this work, as it comes from Mr. Oakeley's hands, contains, not only additions to the text of Holy Scripture, but even direct and deliberate contradictions of the sacred text. Has Mr. Oakeley really deceived himself into believing the Church of England to be in such a state, that any considerable number of her children think it lawful to treat the word of God in such a manner? Is he so ignorant of the feelings and principles of the most respectable and truly pious persons in the community, as to speak seriously of having been guided in the preparation of such a book, by a desire "to retain nothing which might offend and perplex"? As to many persons being *perplexed* by such writings, there seems no likelihood of it;—little, if any, weight (I suppose) being attached to them, beyond the immediate circle of his admirers, and the party

of which Mr. Newman is the head. But the idea of his adapting this volume to the wants of our church with a desire "to retain nothing which might *offend*,"—is so incomprehensible, that one can scarcely imagine him to be serious. God forbid that this church should ever be reduced to such a state of spiritual blindness, as that the majority of earnest and conscientious persons should not be offended at any such irreverent tampering with the text of Holy Scripture. Before all considerations of the particular errors and superstitions which Mr. Oakeley has set himself to propagate, the good sense and good feeling of Christians turn with disgust from the presumption, that dares to say what God has left unsaid, and, by the dreaming vagaries of an ill-governed and licentious imagination, to fill up details which the infinite wisdom of the Author of inspiration has deemed it safer to conceal from his creatures.

When Mr. Oakeley states that the angel spoke to the blessed Virgin *twice* before she answered his salutation, and when he attempts to pervert the plain and obvious meaning of her words by putting into her mouth a declaration that she had taken "a vow of perpetual virginity," people *are* offended—all, namely, whose opinion is worthy of consideration—and that, not so much by the disingenuous attempt to compel the Holy Scripture to teach the superstitions of Rome, as by the attempt to compel it to

teach anything at all. For, whatever be the pharisaical notion of humility advocated by this school, the humility of faith, honesty, and the love of truth, is a spirit that trembles at the word of God, and dares not to add or to subtract a syllable, when the Almighty has spoken what he sees fit to reveal. And so likewise is it true, that what God has not revealed, a spirit of genuine, affectionate piety, unless the understanding be disordered, will have no desire to imagine—simply because He has *not* revealed it. For, if it be impossible for a devout mind to suppose, that any absence of detail in the sacred narrative can be *unintentional*,—no less certain is it, that he who loves God confides in His *love* not less than in His *wisdom*,—and is satisfied to remain ignorant and in the dark where revelation has left him without light and information—not merely because he relies on the *wisdom* of his Almighty instructor and physician, but because he knows it is the voice of his Father and his Redeemer that speaks, and that it is impossible His *love* could conceal what it were more profitable for His child to know, or leave untold those details, which, if disclosed, would have added to his happiness, or tended to promote his assimilation to the Divine image. I am almost ashamed to make observations which may pass for truisms; but yet, if Mr. Oakeley imagines, that persons of real piety and devotional habits are not likely to be *offended* by what he has thought proper to retain in

this mischievous book, it is right to assure him that they *are* offended, and most deeply, at seeing such liberties taken with the word of God,—and that, with such a total absence of delicacy, propriety, and reverence. The mysteries of the Incarnation, the Nativity, and the Agony of the Lord, are too sacred for angels to intrude into.

The aim and object of these tamperings with Holy Scripture I have here purposely kept out of view, because it would be totally contrary to my design, and a great misrepresentation of my own judgment in the matter, were I to lead my reader to suppose, that I consider the *moral* of Mr. Oakeley's fables the point of *primary*, or even *secondary*, importance. Mr. Oakeley, of course, as well as Mr. Newman and the writers of the "Lives of the Saints," mean to advocate Romanism, or, more truly speaking, Popery. This is their object. They make no secret of their intention. And, however plainly irreconcileable with common honesty and their obligations as clergymen of the United Church, their conduct and principles appear, still I have no desire whatever to forget, even for a moment, that they have a Master to whom alone they must give account of their treatment of their consciences. The Romanizing tendency and object of the movement is now fully developed. Mr. Oakeley's mode of handling the sacred narrative is only a part of the theological system, of which he openly avows him-

self the advocate. But this is scarcely a secondary point. That which it is really of primary importance to notice is, the want of regard for truth; which, whenever it comes to meddle with religion, is sure to take liberties with the text of Holy Scripture, whatever be the particular system or opinions it is employed to advocate. And by want of regard for truth I do not mean an intention to deceive, or an habitual preference for falsehood *as* falsehood; but simply a negation—a want,—a want of perception of the preciousness and sacredness of truth itself,—and by consequence—that confusion of the conscience and understanding, which is the material of which Jesuits are made, and the instrument by which Jesuitism effects its worst and most hateful objects. For, truly, if there was no dishonesty in the world, but *wilful* dishonesty, the power of Jesuitism to do mischief would be limited indeed. Much allowance, no doubt, should be made for the habits of interpretation and explanation both of the Bible and the formularies of the church, which the leaders of this movement brought from the theological school in which they were educated, to the investigation and defence of what they called Church Principles. And indeed, without some allowances of this sort, the simplicity with which Mr. Oakeley speaks of his desire "to retain nothing which might offend," must be wholly incomprehensible.

Mr. Oakeley proceeds:—

We live, too, it needs not to be said, in days, of which criticism and suspicion (whether with good, or with evil, design and effect) are even characteristic. We have lost, *from circumstances*, that temper which some feel so essential to goodness as well as to happiness, the temper of *confidence*. Our own church, which we *long to love* with the most devout affection, and to confide in with the most unreserved submission, *will not allow us*, so far as she comes before us in her actual bearings, *to trust her;* and, without trust, love must ever languish. The necessary condition of confidence in the children is oneness in the mind, and harmony in the tones, of the Mother. The Church of England, our Mother, (as she comes before us, not as we might conceive of her,) is of many minds and many, nay, contradictory voices. Hence they who cannot live without trust, are driven upon reposing their trust elsewhere than in the existing, energizing system ; whether in the idea of the ancient church, or *in the living church, as elsewhere manifested*, or in the Saints of the church collectively, or *in some particular Saint*, or, again, some living teacher, or model of sanctity, who may seem to be especially commended to their confidence. Yet the process of *unsettling* which the course of recent circumstances has necessarily brought with it, although not without its compensations and its remedies, has undoubtedly given a shock to the mind of our church, the effects of which are obviously and experimentally apparent. Many of us, perhaps, are tempted to trust some one object, be it system, or theory, or individual, with too little care to adjust the relative claims of many, and thus, while confiding in spirit on the whole, are apt to be critical and suspicious, where we ought rather to confide. And if the confiding be in danger of the spirit of criticism, they (and such there are) who make a merit of confiding implicitly on nothing, will be even wholly swayed by it. Such, then, are the difficulties with which we have to contend, if we will not, as we cannot, sail with the stream.—pp. xxviii. xxix.

Now, really, when we recollect the claims Mr. Oakeley has made in a letter to his diocesan which he has thought proper to print,—when we recollect the principles advocated by Mr. Newman in his acknowledged works—and, above all, in the Tract No. 90,—when we find Dr. Pusey undertaking to bring out, for the benefit of the English church, such books as Surin, and the Spiritual Exercises of Ignatius Loyola,—to say nothing of the mystery in which Mr. Newman chooses to involve his degree of connexion with the Lives of the English Saints, —when we recollect these things, and innumerable others, of a similar sort, it does seem most extraordinary to find Mr. Oakeley talking of *suspicion*, as if it were part of the degeneracy of the age. Matters have gone rather beyond *suspicion*. That might have been very proper and natural a few years ago. Those who were then *suspected*, are now *known*. If this movement had produced nothing more than the non-natural system of subscription, it must have subjected every one connected with it to most grave *suspicion*,—and have placed the sanity of any one who did not suspect them in a very questionable position. If men *will* trifle with truth and honesty, they must pay the penalty in loss of character. And really, it is too late *then* to deprecate suspicion. "We have lost," says Mr. Oakeley, "*from circumstances*, that temper which some feel so essential to goodness as well as to happiness, the temper of *confidence*." But is

it possible he can be so blind as not to know, that the party of which he is so active a member, have done more to destroy that "temper of confidence," than any other set of men in existence—and that the dishonest shifts and evasions and subterfuges of his party, are the real "circumstances" which have helped so much to bring the principles of the Church of England into disrepute, and to involve in suspicion every one who holds the doctrines of the church, as if he sympathized with a movement, which he regards with the regret it cannot fail to excite in every true and faithful son of the church. And yet Mr. Oakeley talks gravely of "the process of unsettling which the course of recent circumstances has necessarily brought with it"—just as if the suspicion and heart-burnings and distrust which his own party have created, were to be attributed to an earthquake or some other natural disturbance. But men soon become adepts in the arts of self-deception. If it were not so, how could one explain the phenomenon of a clergyman of the Church of England, complaining of being subjected to suspicion and want of confidence, at the very moment he is talking of *longing to love* the church, —at the very moment he is publicly accusing the church he calls his mother, of *not allowing* her children to trust her, and of driving them to repose their trust "in the living church as elsewhere manifested;"—in other words, charging the Church of England with the guilt of their secret of

avowed apostasy to Rome? Who may be the "particular saint" in whom these unhappy men repose their trust, Mr. Oakeley has not explained: but when once men have forsaken the paths of truth and uprightness, it can be no wonder if they should place their trust in some confidence of their own devising.

And yet, while Mr. Oakeley himself proves that his principles are not to be depended on, and while his language towards the church is dictated by such a spirit of crimination as no true and loyal son of the church could use, he goes on in the same strain of injured innocence, as if his fidelity to his principles as an English clergyman were beyond suspicion.

> Individual writers, or editors, whose acts, without their protestations, and in spite of their laments, should in all fairness protect them against the charge of undutifulness towards their own church, must still put up with such charges, or violate their consciences *by expressing reverence where they cannot feel it, or withdrawing confidence where they cannot but repose it.*—p. xxix.

In other words—if clergymen of the Church of England will express such confidence in Rome, as no one can be expected to profess except an ultramontane Jesuit,—if they will speak of the English church and Reformation in such terms, and in a spirit of such bitterness and malignity, as are an outrage upon decency—Mr. Oakeley thinks it is very hard that their "protestations" and "laments" should not "protect them against the charge of unfaithfulness towards their own church."

CHAPTER II.

MR. OAKELEY'S ACCOUNT OF HIS WORK CONTINUED.

But what do these men want? Nothing do they want, but to be allowed to do as they please; and to revolutionize the church, after the ideal which the wantonness of their private judgment has erected into a standard of Catholicity. What are their Church Principles? Nothing, in truth, but a self-willed and eclectic sectarianism, which will make them restless and dissatisfied and untractable in whatever church they may be placed, whether by circumstances or by choice. But Mr. Oakeley proceeds—

Well indeed may they bear with such reproaches, (especially when tempered with so much more of confidence and kindness in other quarters than they have any right to expect,) since even the Saints themselves are objects of jealousy and suspicion, or, at best, of what, though far more reverent, is perhaps even less intelligible, than more open animadversion, a kind of patronizing and apologetic tone of criticism, as "men better than their system," or the like. And yet the Saints were certainly either more or less than this tone of modified animadversion seems to presume; more, and so to be venerated, or less, and so to be denounced. Their characteristics at least are not equivocal; their holiness was either the most glorious of works, or the subtlest of counterfeits; their devotion, the nearest approach which earth admits to a perpetual "conversation in heaven," or a deliberate and systematic infringement of the honours due to God alone. —pp. xxix., xxx.

But is there no such thing as fanaticism—as enthusiasm—as self-deception? Is there no medium between piety and hypocrisy—between truth and wilful falsehood?

And whatever the Saints were, it was the church who made them what they so were; her honour or disgrace is intimately and inseparably bound up with theirs; they imbibed her lessons with the most devout reverence, yielded to her authority with the most implicit submission; they were cradled on her lap, "sucked the breasts of her consolations," were sustained through her Sacraments, died in her arms. Was ever mother more absolute? Were ever children more dutiful? What pretence then for discriminating between her and them? If she had played false to her Lord, (*alas, that we should be driven upon the discussion of hypotheses, which can hardly be even so much as imagined without pollution!*) then were they nothing else than "children of the sorceress." But if they were a holy generation, yea, the holiest among the holy, then was she *nothing less than the chaste and immaculate Spouse of Christ.*—p. xxx.

Now, it is really waste of time to discuss this infinitely absurd passage, which goes altogether on the supposition, that those who are reckoned Saints by the Romish church must be taken to be so on the sole authority of her dictum. Surely a very slight knowledge of history would have sufficed to inform Mr. Oakeley, that in earlier ages many names were enrolled in calendars on very slender authority. But, to come to times where a greater exactness of scrutiny is pretended, is it not certain (and when one recollects how these writers have put

themselves forward on every point connected with the Popish controversy, I apprehend this will not appear the least remarkable feature of the case) that any one who was even moderately acquainted with the theory of Canonization would know, that this is a notion which would find no entertainment among Roman theologians or canonists. They conform to the offices of the saints in submission to the authority of the church. But they consider the decree and sentence of canonization to rest solely on legal evidence of matters of fact—they admit that such evidence may be false—and that the character or merits of the candidate for canonization may be mistaken or misrepresented—and therefore, they allege that, besides all the other precautions which they boast of taking, the Pope protects himself from compromising his infallibility by a protestation beforehand; and consequently, whether the Pope was, or was not, deceived in the case of any particular saint, as to the truth of his miracles—the genuineness of his writings—the sanctity of his character—the facts of his history—or even his existence—this is, and ever must be, an open question: and consequently a defence or criticism of the conduct or character of any particular saint would not seem so very shocking or irreverent to well-educated Romanists, as these writers affect to consider it. Does any one living pretend to possess any infallible criterion to detect hypocrisy? If not, it need be no accusation even

against the infallibility of the Roman church, to question the sanctity or wisdom of one whom she has canonized. How Roman catholics contrive to reconcile their *prayers* to any particular saint, with the admission, that they are not necessarily required to believe him to be a saint at all, it is needless here to explain, though they do take some trouble to reconcile this difficulty. But that they are compelled to treat such matters as open questions is absolutely certain, and, indeed, is unavoidable,—and that for the simplest of all reasons, that it is not impossible to show the most egregious historical blunders in papal bulls of canonization. However, it is more important at present to proceed with this quotation from Mr. Oakeley:—

Still, whatever the difficulty of selecting, it has been felt imperative *to admit nothing into the following pages which*, after the most anxious endeavours to strike a balance between what seemed conflicting claims of duty, *was thought on the whole less likely to edify than to startle.* The object of the work not being historical nor literary, but immediately practical; not to record facts, which are as they are, and which it may be a duty to exhibit in their true colours, however unacceptable, nor to discharge an office of editorial fidelity, (what is given being intended, not to suggest certain conclusions only indirectly practical, but to supply a manual for devotional use) it was felt right to *introduce nothing which the Editor could not recommend to all others, as well as receive himself.* The consequence has been that passages have been here and there omitted, *not on doctrinal grounds*, (which do not come into question in this particular work,) but as *somewhat more*

extreme instances of the principle, now sought to be vindicated, than, it was felt, would carry their own justification with them, at least till the principle itself be more generally understood and recognised. And perhaps *it may without presumption be hoped that the blessed Saint with whose work these liberties have been unwillingly taken, will acquit, at least of all intentional irreverence towards himself, this seeming act of it;* hazarded, as it is, at all events in that spirit of charity which he illustrated, and with the hope of furthering those sacred ends of unity and peace, to which, as we cannot doubt, he would desire to contribute.—p. xxxi.

To those who recollect the liberties which this Life of Christ takes with the word of God—and in this extract Mr. Oakeley has fully and deliberately committed himself to them all—this last sentence will appear so extraordinary, as to make them question whether the writer can be sane. For how any Christian of sound understanding could write so concerning such a work, is wholly inexplicable. However, Mr. Oakeley has spoken candidly; and, whatever may be the opinion which other Christians shall entertain of the book, he declares that he has introduced nothing in the translation which *he* "could not recommend to all others, as well as receive himself." What he has left out, it seems, has not been omitted "on *doctrinal* grounds . . . but, as *somewhat more extreme* instances of the principle [of meditation] now sought to be vindicated, than, it is felt, would carry their own justification with them, at least till the principle itself be more gene-

rally understood and recognised;"—which it is sincerely hoped it never may. But what must Mr. Oakeley have omitted, if he has left out things more improper and shocking than what he has retained? And, what is not a little remarkable, there is another passage in this introduction, which looks as if he were not quite satisfied with resting the defence of everything in this book on the theory of meditation. The passage is also well worth transcribing, as an illustration of the manner in which this school misapply the promises of Holy Scripture to suit a present purpose:—

"Why should it seem a thing incredible" to us, who know that the Holy Spirit is straitened in His communications of Divine Truth *by nothing* but our want of faith and holiness, that, in ages of greater faith than our own, points other than those expressly recorded in Scripture, though illustrative of them, should have been even *supernaturally imparted* to men of mortified lives, such as our author, giving themselves up wholly to prayer? But if this appear to some too hard a saying, then let us consider *whether we have any settled confidence in such promises as* "If any man will do My will, he shall know of the doctrine;" or "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God;" or "God will reveal even this unto you." Or, to take the lowest ground, and treat the question as one of mere secondary causes and effects, I suppose that habitual and reverential study of Holy Scripture, such as we know that men like St. Bernard, or St. Bonaventure, practised, will be allowed to give them, and such as they, a strong claim upon our respectful and attentive hearing in any views which they may have propounded upon the hidden meanings of the inspired text, or the probable, though unre-

corded, words and actions of Him, who, as we know, both said and did more than the very world itself would contain, besides all which we have been expressly told in Scripture concerning Him.—p. ix.

Now, really, it would be very sad to think, that many persons could be imposed on by such wretched sophistry. If there be such a thing in the world as truth, and if falsehood be wrong and criminal—to alter any historical document, to invent facts, and supply words and actions, at the caprice of one's own imagination, is a violation of truth and a sin. And, to speak plainly, without saying or thinking anything uncharitable, this attempt of Mr. Oakeley's to mystify his reader and himself, does look but too like the way a man goes on when he is endeavouring to argue with his conscience. How do we know that these things were not "supernaturally imparted" to Bonaventure?—and why are we not to attend to such men as Bonaventure and Bernard, when they "propounded" views on the "hidden meanings of the inspired text," and "probable though unrecorded words and actions"? Be it so:—but to Mr. Oakeley's argument the answer is plain,—that these "unrecorded words and actions" are not propounded as views, or as supernatural discoveries, but as meditations, as devout inventions, and as flights of imagination; and to adopt such an explanation in this apologetic tone seems to betray a secret consciousness, that these arts of meditation are not quite so

laudable, or even so easily justified, as their advocate would fain persuade himself. As to this application of such promises as "If any man will do my will, he shall know of the doctrine;" "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God;" and "God shall reveal this to you;"—it is such a palpable and gross perversion of Holy Scripture, that it could not be considered as anything short of great irreverence and a very flagrant violation of truth, even if it had not been resorted to merely to serve a turn, and justify conduct which common sense and conscience must condemn as dishonest.

Although the words last cited would look, as if Mr. Oakeley was not altogether satisfied with his theory of meditation, a subsequent passage seems as if he had succeeded in persuading himself into a belief of the lawfulness of the pursuit. It is deserving of quotation, as showing the extraordinary methods by which these writers contrive to impose on themselves.

How often do the inspired writers, or rather He who speaks in and through them, strike as it were some two or three chords of a sacred theme, and then leave to the spiritual student the delightful task of framing the entire harmony for himself, at once guiding and guarding his *devout invention*, without forcing and ruling it! Why in such cases does Scripture go so far in its disclosures without going further? Why so far, if it be not to prompt holy musings? why no further, except there be some especial value in the freedom and spontaneousness of those musings? It is the very method of Scripture to teach by

hints, which are lost upon the thoughtless, but eloquent to the wise: which they therefore are pretty sure to turn to a good account, who turn them to any; the devotion which is real enough to use them at all, being for the most part instructed enough to use them aright. This, however, does not make guidance in so delicate a process the less acceptable to humble and serious Christians, who naturally desire to perform so solemn an exercise not only well, but in the most perfect manner which their circumstances admit.—p. xiii.

One might have thought that any one who cared to ask—"why in such cases does Scripture go so far in its disclosures without going further?"—might have discovered a more satisfactory answer to his question. Mr. Oakeley's illustrations of his meaning, however, do not give much reason to suppose that he was likely to prefer the *true* to the *ingenious*.

One or two instances will serve to clear our meaning. The holy Evangelist relates, that the Blessed Virgin, when she went to visit her cousin St. Elizabeth, travelled "with haste." Why was this? It was out of keeping with her usual calm deportment and orderly movements. St. Bonaventure offers a reason, which, *whether the true one or not, supplies a very beautiful and appropriate ground of meditation:* "She was loth," he supposes, "in her great modesty and love of retirement, to be seen long abroad." —pp. xiii., xiv.

Just so. Very beautiful and appropriate, whether it be true or not! Yet, if truth is the only source of comfort to a soul really desirous of salvation, and hungering and thirsting for righteousness, such an one, I suppose, could see little beauty in that of which

it knows not whether it be true or not. And certainly, the text of the Evangelist would seem to suggest a reason fully as beautiful, though not quite so far-fetched. It is proper, however, to lay before the reader the passage in The Life of Christ to which Mr. Oakeley there refers.

Neither the length of the journey, nor the roughness of the road, could deter her from her pious resolution; but she went *with haste*, not wishing to appear long in public. *Nor was she, like other women in her condition, in the least encumbered by the Divine Infant she bore within her; for the Lord Jesus was no burden to His Mother.*—p. 16.

I suppose, if Mr. Oakeley thought this "less likely to edify than to startle," he would not have retained it, but left it out, and trusted to the blessed saint to forgive the liberty he had taken with his writings;—which, considering the liberties the saint himself was in the habit of taking with the Bible, must seem not a very unreasonable expectation. But, will Mr. Oakeley and his admirers please to consider, what effects such fancies and meditations are likely to have on the faith of their disciples touching the verity of the Lord's human nature? A little further on, Bonaventure describes the birth of St. John.

When Elizabeth's full time was come, she was happily delivered of a son, which our Lady received in her arms, and swaddled with becoming care. The infant, as if conscious of the majesty of his nurse, fixed his eyes steadfastly on her, so taken with her beauty, that, when she delivered him again to his mother, he still looked towards her as if

he could take delight in none but her; while she, on the other hand, continued graciously playing with him, embracing him, and cherishing him with her heavenly lips. What excess of honour was this for St. John! What pure mortal, besides himself, was ever blessed with such a nurse! Yet this is not the only great privilege he enjoyed. Many others might be named, were they not foreign to our present purpose.

On the eighth day the child was circumcised, and called John. Then was the mouth of Zacharias opened, and he prophesied, saying, "*Blessed be the Lord God of Israel*," and the rest. Thus were the *Magnificat* and *Benedictus*, those two canticles of matchless beauty, composed in this house. In the meantime, *while the latter was singing*, our blessed Lady, virgin-like, to avoid being gazed on by the men who were present, on account of the ceremony, kept apart in a secret recess of the chamber, where, unseen, she could hear what passed, and there devoutly listened to the prophecies uttered concerning her Divine Son: carefully and wisely depositing the whole in her heart.—pp. 17, 18.

This also may be very beautiful and very appropriate. I venture no opinion on such a question. But though Mr. Oakeley scorns such considerations, I cannot help asking, whether it be true or not. St. Luke certainly gives no countenance to the idea that the Virgin remained with Elizabeth till John was born. But how do we know that Bonaventure was not inspired to correct St. Luke? Just so. *How do we know?* And so, in a short time, we may expect to be uncertain whether we know anything. Indeed, Bonaventure himself sometimes gives authorities for his meditations. In a former chapter, we

have seen that he attributes his disgusting fable of the circumstances of the Lord's nativity to a brother of his order, whom, he says, he believes to have been supernaturally inspired; and, in another passage, he says:—

We have already seen how many were the afflictions He suffered, together with the great poverty, privation, and distress He underwent at the time of His sacred birth. But among other things was this, which has not hitherto been mentioned. His blessed Mother, when she had laid him in the manger, having no pillow with which to raise His head, made use for that purpose of a stone, which *it is not unlikely she might have covered with hay. This I had from a devout brother, who saw it in spirit;* and *to this day the same stone appears, a visible memorial of the fact.* A cushion or a pillow, *we may piously imagine*, would much rather have been her choice, had she possessed one; but, having nothing more proper to answer the end, to the great affliction of her tender heart, she was compelled to make use of a stone.—pp. 31, 32.

So that the process of Meditation (or "*devout invention*," as Mr. Oakeley calls it) seems sometimes to require some adventitious aid. But does Mr. Oakeley really wish it to be believed that this stone is still to be seen? To return, however, to the passage in Mr. Oakeley's introduction, where we left off.

Again, we read, that the wise men offered our Lord in His infancy "gold" among other produce of their country; and *we gather from intimations that it was very considerable.* May we not innocently and profitably reflect upon the use to which these treasures were applied? What became of all this gold? For we cannot suppose that what was offered in such sort was thanklessly cast aside

Yet there are, as we know, but two sacred uses to which such gifts of Divine bounty are applicable; the service of the Sanctuary, and the benefit of the poor. But when the Lord of the Temple was in the holy tabernacle of his flesh, there was no need of "temples made with hands" to enshrine His glory, nor of the gold which those Temples sanctify, to symbolize the riches of His mercy. Our Saint then *devoutly imagines* that these consecrated treasures supplied to the Blessed Mother of our Lord the means of discharging that one duty from which the estate of poverty is precluded—bountiful almsgiving.—p. xiv.

Now, as the Virgin was poor, if gold in any quantity was given, it might not be unreasonable to suppose (if one must suppose anything) that it served to support her in her necessities during her flight into Egypt. Bonaventure, however, (could Mr. Oakeley be ignorant of this?) adapts the story, as he has done elsewhere, to suit the notions of voluntary poverty adopted by his order. This is his account of the transaction:—

The three kings, therefore, being come to Bethlehem, *with a great multitude of people, and a noble retinue*, stopped, as the star directed them, at the little shed in which our Lord Jesus was born. The blessed Virgin hears a confused noise of people at the door, and snatches up her Divine Child. At the same instant the three kings enter the little dwelling, fall on their knees, and worship the Child Jesus, their Lord, with all reverence. They honour Him as their King, and worship him as their God. Reflect how great must have been their faith! What was there, as far as appearances went, which could have moved them to believe that this little Infant, whom they found in the arms of a mother as poor as Himself, so meanly

clad, so miserably housed, without company, attendants, or other signs of dignity, could be in truth a King, and Very God? Yet they believed both. Such are our guides to the feet of Christ, such the great originals it befits us to copy. Behold them still on their knees before Him. And now they begin to converse with the holy Virgin, and ask many questions concerning her beloved Son, which they might do, either by the help of an interpreter, or of themselves, since they were men of great learning, and perhaps versed in the Hebrew language. They inquire of her the particular circumstances relating to the wondrous Infant. *Our Lady tells them all*, and they readily believe all she tells them. Consider them well, how reverently they speak and listen, as if in the presence of royalty. Consider our Lady, too, how she shrinks from conversing; and how she speaks and hears what is necessary, *with a blush on her cheek, and her eyes fixed on the ground.* Yet the Lord gave her more than usual strength on this great occasion, and enabled her TO SUPPORT HER DIGNITY BEFORE THESE PRINCELY WORSHIPPERS, WHO REPRESENTED THE WHOLE FUTURE CHURCH. Consider, once more, the Child Jesus, who, though *not as yet pleased to speak, comports Himself with a sweet gravity beyond his years*, as gifted with Divine intelligence, and *gently smiles as He looks on them;* the while they are wondrously delighted with Him, and gaze upon Him not only with their bodily eyes, but, as it were, with the eyes of the mind, as catching somewhat of His illumination, and being drawn towards Him, who was fairer than all the children of men. At length, full of joy and consolation, they open their coffers, and spreading a carpet at the feet of our Lord Jesus, kneel down before Him, and devoutly offer Him gold, frankincense, and myrrh, of which the gold far exceeded the rest in abundance. For had their offerings been but small, and of little value, they need not have "opened their treasures," as the Gospel says they did,

since more scanty and insignificant gifts might have been easily conveyed by the hands of their attendants.

Then they reverently cast themselves on the ground, and devoutly kissed His sacred feet. And *why may not we piously imagine, that the blessed Infant*, full of Divine wisdom, the more to comfort them, and settle their affections on Him, *stretched out His little hand for them to kiss, and blessed them with it?* After this, they bowed themselves once more, and, taking their leave, retired with joyous and peaceful hearts, and returned by another way into their own country.

But what, think you, did the blessed Virgin do with *all this quantity* of valuable gold? Did she, think you, hoard it up for her own or her Divine Son's use, or put it out to usury? Did she lay it out in the purchase of houses, lands, or vineyards? No, she was too great a lover of poverty for that. In her *zeal for that blessed estate*, and with her intimate knowledge of her Son's will, both revealed to her within, and *exhibited by infallible tokens without*, (*since, perhaps, He turned away His eyes from the gold as if with aversion,*) she expended the whole, as I judge, in the course of a few days, for the use of the poor. For it was distressing to her to have such a sum in her possession, or to devise means for laying it out upon herself. How, indeed, could any such private use have been found for it by her, who, when she went into the temple at her Purification, had not so much as a single lamb to *offer for her Son*, but was forced to buy turtle-doves or pigeons?* It is reasonable, then, to suppose both that the offering of the wise men was costly, and that our Lady, studious of poverty, and full of charity, bestowed it upon the poor.

* This argument rests on the supposition that the visit of the wise men took place before the Purification. I should like to see how Mr. Oakeley proves this. The Evangelist would lead one to form a different conclusion.

You have here, gentle reader, before your eyes, the truest and best encomium of poverty: observe, then, the two following points. First, the Child Jesus, and His holy Mother, the blessed Virgin, *disdained not to receive alms like needy persons.* Secondly, they were so far from being anxious to obtain riches, or hoard them, that *they would not so much as keep* what was liberally bestowed upon them, increasing daily in the love and desire of poverty. —pp. 37—40.

Is there any error, any heresy, any superstition, which cannot be extorted out of the word of God by a process like this? And is it not evident, from this and other passages, that these writers, by their licentious abuse of their imaginations, are reducing the Incarnation to the level of a myth, and fable, and a poet's dream?

CHAPTER III.

MR. OAKELEY'S MEDITATION ON THE PURIFICATION.

In the account given by Mr. Oakeley of the Purification, to say nothing of the variety of fictitious circumstances introduced into it, the Lord is represented as acting in a manner inconsistent with his condition as an infant a few weeks old.

Now when the fortieth day was come, as prescribed by the Law, our Lady, with the Child Jesus and St. Joseph, set out from Bethlehem on her way to Jerusalem, about six miles distant, there to present her blessed Son to the Lord, as it is written in the Law. Do you in thought go with them, and *help the sacred Virgin to carry her Divine Infant;* and fix your mind, as if present, on all which is now to be said or done, for it is a subject of the most exalted devotion.

Thus then do they bring the Lord of the temple to the temple of the Lord. At the entrance they buy a pair of turtle-doves, or two young pigeons, *to offer to God for Him*, as was the custom of other poor people. But as they were poorer even than most, we may rather suppose, that their offerings consisted only of two pigeons, which were of less price than the doves; and for that reason are mentioned the last in the Law. And the holy Evangelist takes no notice here of a lamb, which was the usual offering of the rich. At this time the holy Simeon, who was a man both just and devout, came with haste into the temple to see Christ the Son of God, whom the Holy Ghost had promised that he should see before his death. He no sooner beheld the Divine Babe, than he knew Him by the spirit of prophecy within him, and pressing towards Him, fell on

his knees and worshipped Him in His Mother's arms. *The holy Infant blessed him; and looking earnestly upon his Mother*, bent forward, in token that He desired to go to him. This His Mother understanding, gave Him to Simeon, who with joy and reverence received Him in his arms; and then arose, and, blessing God, said: *Lord, now lettest Thou Thy servant depart in peace*, and the rest; prophesying many things concerning his Passion. And holy Anna, the prophetess, came up at that instant, and, worshipping Him, also spoke many things relating to Him. But Mary, wondering at all these things, kept them close in her heart. At length, *the Child Jesus stretching forth His arms towards His Mother*, was again received by her. After this, they advance towards the altar, in the manner of a procession, *which is annually represented throughout the church on Candlemas-day*. First went the two venerable old men, Joseph and Simeon, hand in hand, singing with transports of joy: *O give thanks unto the Lord, for He is gracious, and His mercy endureth for ever. The Lord is righteous in all His ways, and holy in all His works. For this God is our God for ever and ever. We wait for Thy loving kindness, O God, in the midst of Thy temple.* These were followed by the sacred Mother herself, bearing in her arms Jesus the Infant King, with Anna by her side, she pouring forth her soul in thanksgiving beyond expression, in which her companion joined her. These, then, were all who formed this procession, which, though consisting of few persons, represented great mysteries; for these were but the first-fruits of an innumerable company of every sex and every state, youth, celibacy, marriage, and widowhood. When they were come to the altar, the holy Mother knelt down, with all reverence and devotion, and offered her dearest Son to His heavenly Father, saying: "Vouchsafe, O most sovereign Lord, to receive this Thy beloved Son, whom, according to the commandment of Thy Law, I here offer unto Thee as the first-born of His mother.

But I beseech Thy mercy, most gracious Father, to vouchsafe to restore Him again to me." And then rising, she laid him upon the altar. O great God, and most merciful Lord, what a precious and most acceptable Offering was this! such surely as had never before been made from the beginning of time, nor shall ever be made again.

Consider each point attentively. The blessed Infant Jesus quietly remains upon the altar, like any other little child, and *with a look of intelligence beyond his years, fixes his eyes upon his mother, and the rest who stand about him, humbly waiting with patience, to see what more is to be done.* The priests enter solemnly with their attendants, and the Sovereign Lord of all things is redeemed like a slave at the low price of five pence, or five small pieces of coin called shekels, the sum given for other poor children. After Joseph had paid them to the priest, the blessed Mother joyfully received him again into her arms. Then taking from Joseph the above-mentioned pair of pigeons, she knelt down, and lifting up her eyes devoutly to heaven, offered them, saying: "Vouchsafe, most merciful Father, to accept this offering, *the first little gift which Thy beloved Son, of his extreme poverty, this day presents unto Thee!*" Then *He, stretching forth His hands towards the little birds, raised his eyes to heaven, and though He said nothing, yet signified by His gestures that He offered them together with His Mother.* And so she left them upon the altar.

Consider here, Christian reader, and diligently contemplate the great dignity and majesty of those who make this offering: the blessed Virgin Mother, and her Divine Son Jesus. Could such an offering, think you, though a little one, be rejected of God? No; rather may we devoutly suppose it to have been carried up to heaven by the hands of Angels, and there presented by them, and to have been most graciously accepted, at the Eternal Throne, amidst the joyful thanksgivings of the whole company of blessed spirits.

The offering having been duly made, the holy Virgin quitted Jerusalem, on her return home to Nazareth. *On the way*,* she stopped at the house of St. Elizabeth, wishing to see St. John before she left the neighbourhood. Do you accompany her whithersoever she goes, and in devout meditation *assist her to carry the Babe.* When our blessed Lady and St. Elizabeth met, they were extremely overjoyed at the sight of each other, but more especially in beholding each their blessed sons Jesus and John, *who, with no less tokens of joy, lovingly congratulated one another;* and St. John, as conscious of the dignity of His sacred Guest, behaved towards Him with the utmost submission and respect. Do you also reverently receive the child John, for he is great in the sight of the Lord, and *haply he may give you a blessing.*—pp. 42—46.

Besides its other peculiarities, this passage contains a covert contradiction of the Holy Scripture. For the turtle-doves or young pigeons were not an offering from the child;—nor was the mother to lay them on the altar: but they were an atonement for the mother, and she was commanded to bring them to the door of the tabernacle, and to deliver them to the priest, who was to offer them before the Lord, the one for a burnt offering, and the other for a sin offering, and make an atonement for her. But this account of the matter would not suit with the notion of the immaculate and sinless purity of the Virgin. And so the Scripture narrative is falsified, and the turtle-doves or pigeons, which in reality were offered by the priest as a burnt-offering and a sin-offering,

* Is it necessary that the meditator should suppose the hill country of Juda to be *on the way* from Jerusalem to Nazareth?

for an atonement and purification for the mother, are represented, in one place, as being offered for the Son, and in another, as a gift presented by the Son, together with his mother. One would be glad to believe that Mr. Oakeley was not aware of the purpose for which the story is made to contradict the Scripture; but whether he was or not, the crime of doing violence to the Word of God remains the same.

Altogether, this is an exceedingly remarkable passage; particularly when one recollects, that Mr. Oakeley informs us, he *has* made alterations in the text of his author, where he conceived the matter was "less likely to edify than to startle," and where the principle of Meditation was carried further than the public mind is yet prepared for. And what makes this account of the Purification the more worthy of notice is, that Mr. Oakeley has, in the place referred to, expressly guarded against his reader's supposing, that the passages he has omitted seemed objectionable to him on account of the *doctrine* they contained. On the whole, therefore, it would seem that the only explanation to be given of his retaining this account of the Purification is this, —either that he does not understand it, which is hardly credible;—or, that he does not feel any objection to altering the sacred text, in order to make it square with the doctrines he has adopted with regard to the sinless nature of the Virgin Mary. For

Bonaventure maintains, that the Virgin had no need for purification, and that she submitted to it voluntarily, as to a "law made for others;"—and this passage Mr. Oakeley *has* retained.* Now, this error of the immaculate perfection of her nature is confuted by the mere fact of her having a burnt-offering and a sin-offering offered for her atonement and cleansing; consequently, as the Scripture account of the transaction will not consist with the doctrines of this school, the birds (as we have seen) are said to have been bought by Joseph and Mary, to "offer to God" FOR the child, and afterwards the sacrifice of the Purification is stated to have been laid on the altar by the Virgin, and presented by the Lord as a "little gift" to His Heavenly Father, conjointly with His mother. Would it not have been more decent,—it would be folly to say, more reverent,—to have composed this "Life of Christ" as a pure fiction, without any reference whatever to the Sacred Text, than in this unblushing manner to do violence to the Word of God? It is very easy to say,—"Whatever be the truth on this subject, it is one on which I find it especially sweet to meditate;† or, "Though it is uncertain whose marriage it was that was celebrated at Cana of Galilee, let us, for meditation' sake, suppose it to have been that of St. John the Evangelist;"‡ though

* Page 41. † Page 28. ‡ Page 103.

I cannot understand, why any right-minded person should find any especial sweetness in meditating on anything in religion which he acknowledges may be false and contrary to fact—to say nothing of Mr. Oakeley's statement that the Lord commanded St. John to put away his wife, while he acknowledges that he knows not whether it was St. John's marriage of which the account was given. Those, however, appear trifles compared with deliberate and intentional contradictions of the Sacred History like the present.

And yet the steps are easy by which men arrive even at such impiety as this.

CHAPTER IV.

DANGER OF TAMPERING WITH TRUTH.—DR. PUSEY'S IDEA OF HUMILITY.

When men begin by trifling with truth, they do not feel it so difficult as some imagine to take liberties with Holy Scripture. How easy is it to find illustrations in abundance, from the expositors of prophecy and the commentators—to say nothing of those who adopt an imaginative and poetical style in preaching. Truth is a very sacred deposit; and revealed truth is the life of the human soul; and it seems a law of our being, that, if men have not an inward love and preference for truth, *for its own sake*, they will gradually lose their perception of its relative value and expediency—and so, in the deteriorating process of mental obliquity and confusion, will go on, until they have exposed the unsoundness of their principles by overt acts of dishonesty and falsification. And no less true is it, that all this may coexist with a certain species of devotional feeling and zeal; so that it is anything but impossible for a man even to lay down his life in defence or maintenance of certain truths, who has no love for truth itself, and is utterly ignorant of what it is and what is its value. And hence the mischievous effects of such movements as the present. If the leader of such a movement as this can have so little notion of the

distinction between truth and falsehood, as to teach men, that "it is not more than an hyperbole to say that, in certain cases *a lie is the nearest approach to truth*," is it any wonder that his disciples should adopt the maxims of the Jesuits in their dealings with mankind, or even falsify the Scripture itself, when it happens to stand opposed to their errors and superstitions? For, when the first steps in religion are tainted with disregard of truth, the whole progress of the mind is, to depart further from truth, to confuse the understanding, and to blunt the moral sense. Falsehood soon comes to be mixed up with devotion; even the humility of such men is at best fanaticism—a false estimate of themselves. If this seem too strong language, I shall beg my reader to consider the first principle of the humility these writers are inculcating. For example, here is a passage from Dr. Pusey's preface to Surin:—

Happy, at least is it, if they who think they hold most accurately the corruption of nature, can even understand the language of the self-abhorrence of the saints. Take his, who being asked, "Who were the sheep?" said, "I know not: *I only know that I am of the goats*;"* or his, who ever prayed *that his sins might not bring the vengeance of God on the towns where he preached*,† or of those who

* "I think one of the eastern Anchorites." This note and the five following are Dr. Pusey's.

† "St. Dominic. The like is related of St. Catherine of Sienna, that she thought *all the chastisements of Divine justice, which desolated the provinces in her time*, to be the miserable effects of her unfaithfulness. Nouet."

wept for their sins, until sight was impaired;* or his, who, having renounced all the riches and glories of this world, habitually accounted *his only fit dwelling to be hell*, OR BEING SPIT UPON ALL NIGHT, COUNTED NO PLACE FITTER THAN HIS OWN FACE;† or hers, who, having followed God's leadings since she heard His Name, confessed, "*All my life has been nothing but darkness*, but I will hide myself in the Wounds of Jesus crucified: I will bathe myself in His Blood, which will wash off all my sins;‡ or his,§ who, being asked, to pray for the continuance of a life spent in winning souls, answered, "I am an unprofitable servant, whom neither God nor His people needeth;" or that which has been *the common maxim and first principle* of all saints, that they are to account themselves "the chief of sinners," not professing it only with their lips, but on each occasion acting instantaneously upon it, wishing others to believe it, bearing all reproach patiently, glad to be evil spoken of untruly, acutely pained at any hint of praise, confounded at the mention of any good in them.—pp. xix., xx.

And yet, does it never occur to these writers that, as *all* persons—to say nothing of all *saints*—cannot *all and singular* of them be the *chief* of sinners, a vast deal of such humility as this must consist in sheer self-deception; and, how deception of any kind can be a virtue and a grace, they would do

* "The largeness of the gift of tears continually recurs in the Lives of the Saints."

† "St. Francis Borgia. St. Alphonsus Liguori gives this as one of the preparations of any mental prayer (and so of his own):—'1. My God, I believe Thee present within me, and I adore Thee from the abyss of my nothingness. 2. Lord, I ought now to be in hell, on account of my sins; I am sorry for having offended Thee; pardon me in thy mercy.' (Quoted by Mr. Ward, p. 350.)" Alphonsus Liguori was not always considered a safe guide by Dr. Pusey.

‡ "St. Catherine of Sienna."

§ "St. Francis de Sales."

well to inquire. But, certainly, when self-deception is counted an act of sanctity, it cannot be very surprising if, from deceiving themselves, such saints should fall into the practice of deceiving others.

On this passage, however, Dr. Pusey has added the following as a note:—

All these tests of deep humility may be verified to any extent in the lives of the Saints, not as the results of reflection, but as part of themselves.

The following instances are given by Nouet, L'homme d'oraison, Conduite dans les voies de Dieu. Ent. xi. St. Francis Borgia having employed much time every day in acquiring knowledge of himself, reduced the principles of self-knowledge to these. (1.) I was formed from nothing. (2.) I shall return to nothing. (3.) I know not what I am. (4.) If I know anything, my only knowledge is, that *hell is my* [fitting] *home*. (5.) Of myself I do no good work. St. Theresa being warned one day to take heed of vain-glory, answered, "Vain-glory! *I know not why*, knowing who I am; it is much for me not to despair:" and in her life, "it seems as if, even would I try to have vain-glory, I could not. For I know clearly through the grace which God giveth me, that of myself I can do nothing. On the contrary, God makes me see my miseries, and discovers to me so many unfaithfulnesses, that whatever time I could employ thereon, I should never see so many truths, as I see of them in an instant. Besides, I know not how I could attribute to myself the good which is in me, seeing that a little while ago I was entirely bare of the virtues I possess, which also are the fruits of the mercy of God, and His free gifts, wherein I am, and can do nothing, no more than a painter's canvass, in that, on my part, I can do no more than receive the grace of God, without rendering Him any service. For certainly *I am the most useless person in the world;* I am ashamed to see

what progress every one makes, except myself *who am good for nothing*. What I say is *not humility*, it is *truth. I do not believe that there is in the world a creature worse than myself*, and when I consider the little profit I make of the graces I receive, I sometimes come to fear that I have been deceived." The B. Angela de Foligny said with unspeakable ardour, "O unknown nothingness! O unknown nothingness! I tell you in all truth, that the soul can have no richer knowledge than that of its nothingness." And to St. Catherine our Lord said, "Knowest thou well, who I am and who thou art. Happy wilt thou be, if thou understand it well. I am HE who IS, and thou art she who is not." "In this [Divine] light St. Ignatius looked upon himself AS AN ULCER CONTINUALLY DISCHARGING PUS; Alphonso Rodriguez compared himself to *graves of dead, putrid carcasses, sewers and sinks of vessels where all defilements collect.*" (Comp. our own Bp. Andrewes'* "Morning Devotions." "Despise me not, an unclean worm, a dead dog, a putrid corpse.") "St. Ignatius† used to say that *he did not believe that another could be found*, in whom there was so much ingratitude joined with so many graces and favours which he had received of God; whence *he prayed our Lord to deprive him of his spiritual consolations*, in chastisement of his unfaithfulnesses, to make him more careful and faithful for the future. St. Francis cried out, from time to time, 'Lord, keep, if it please Thee, the treasure of the graces Thou hast deposited in my soul. For I am a thief who rob thee of Thy glory.' St. Gertrude thought it *one of the greatest miracles that the earth should endure her*, seeing *there was no one who did not deserve the favours of God better than herself, and did not*

* What would "our own Bishop Andrewes" say if he could see himself paraded in such company?

† The reader will remember that by "St. Ignatius" Dr. Pusey means (now-a-days) Ignatius Loyola, the founder of the Jesuits.

employ them better." See also St. Vincent Ferrier and St. Catherine of Genoa, below, p. 105. "St. John-of-God, when accused to the Archbishop of Grenada of harbouring dissolute people in his hospital, said, 'The Son of God came to save sinners, and we are bound to labour and pray for their conversion. I am unfaithful to my calling that I neglect this; and I confess that I *know no other bad person in my hospital but myself*,'" &c. Butler.—Surin, Pref. pp. xx.—xxii.

What others may think or say of all this, I really do not pretend to anticipate. Such humility appears to me, (however painful it may be to be obliged to say so) nothing less than fanatical self-deception; and (to speak very plainly) to be far less deserving of the name of humility, than of an intolerable pride and self importance, in which *self* occupies the entire field of vision. But this comes of tampering with truth.

CHAPTER V.

DOCTRINAL CHARACTER OF MR. OAKELEY'S MEDITATIONS.—THE ANNUNCIATION.—THE ASCENSION.—A MEDITATION OF BONAVENTURE'S WHICH MR. OAKELEY OMITTED.

It will, I hope, be in the recollection of my reader that Mr. Oakeley has stated, that, in translating "the Life of Christ," for the use of members of the church of England, he has felt it "right to introduce nothing which" he "could not recommend to all others, as well as receive himself;"—a very remarkable declaration, when we remember, what extraordinary passages have been transcribed from his work into these pages. But it is the sentence immediately following these words, to which I wish now to call my reader's attention.

The consequence has been, (says Mr. Oakeley,) that passages have been here and there omitted, *not on doctrinal grounds*, (which do not come into question in this particular work,) but as somewhat more extreme instances of the principle, now sought to be vindicated, than, it was felt, would carry their own justification along with them, at least till the principle itself be more generally understood and recognised.

It really seems anything but clear, what Mr. Oakeley can mean by saying, that doctrines, or "doctrinal grounds" "do not come into question in this particular work." To one who claims a right to hold all Romish doctrine, it is likely there may

be nothing in Bonaventure's book which could appear objectionable on doctrinal grounds; but those who are satisfied with the catholicity of the English church, when they find this system of Meditation altering and amplifying the history of the life of Christ for the purpose of recommending certain doctrines, will very naturally feel, that it does quite "come into question,"—and that very specially, "in this particular work"—*what are the doctrines* which it is sought to recommend by this extraordinary tampering with the word of God.

The meditation on the Purification, which I have transcribed from this book, is evidently constructed with the view of promoting the belief of the doctrine of the sinlessness of the Virgin Mary. There are other passages of which it is equally clear, that they are designed to foster that superstitious reverence, which in the Romish church has risen to the most revolting idolatry. For instance, in the account of the Annunciation is the following:—

Here put yourself in the Presence of God, and contemplate how the Blessed Trinity, *awaiting the answer and consent* of this beloved daughter, was delighted to behold her chaste gravity of demeanour, and her lowly expressions. *With what wisdom and studious care does the Angel order his every word, so as to prevail with her; with what calm and reverent sweetness does he bend before her, his awful mistress*, faithfully acquitting himself of his commission, and attentively marking her words, that he may reply to them in a manner *befitting her dignity*, his own high office, and the will of the Almighty in this wonderful and

glorious work! And lastly, with what a becoming deportment of fearfulness and humility, mixed with graceful bashfulness of look, does she receive the sudden and astounding message of the Angel, without being elated at it, or bestowing one thought upon herself! And when she hears wondrous things of herself, and such as were never said to any other mortal, she ascribes all to Divine Grace. —p. 12.

This passage does certainly contain *doctrine*, and doctrine of a very serious character; and considering that this fiction aims at nothing less than to support the fearful tenet of the Romish writers, that the salvation of the world depended on the *consent* of the Virgin Mary, Mr. Oakeley must have an extraordinary idea, indeed, of the state of the English church, if he imagines that pious and respectable persons are prepared to receive such a passage, as one which *carries its own justification along with it.*

The account of the Ascension will furnish another instance of this nature. Having mentioned the appearance of the two men in white apparel, who stood by the Apostles immediately after the Lord's disappearance, Mr. Oakeley proceeds—

Here consider how full our Lord Jesus was of tender solicitude in their behalf. For no sooner had He vanished out of their sight than immediately He sent His Angels to them, that they might not be wearied of staying there, and that they might be strengthened on hearing the Angels' testimony that their Lord had ascended, according to His own word. On hearing these tidings from the Angels, *our Lady humbly entreated them to commend her to*

her Son. Then they *reverently made obeisance to her*, and willingly received her commission. The Apostles, Magdalene, and all the rest, besought them in like words. Then they disappeared; and the blessed company returned into the city to Mount Sion, and there continued waiting, as our Lord Jesus had commanded them.—pp. 270, 271.

It is difficult enough to imagine, how any pious mind could have devised this notion of the Virgin Mary sending a message to the Lord by the angels. But, why is it said "they reverently made obeisance to her," except it be, to promote the superstitious reverence Romanists pay to her as queen of angels? However, as Mr. Oakeley has been so careful to guard his reader against supposing that he disapproved of everything he omitted in preparing this book for the members of our Church, —it may not be useless to transcribe some of the matter which he *has* omitted, not, be it remembered, because he objects to it on *doctrinal* grounds, but because he did not feel that it would carry its own justification along with it. Such a passage is the commencing chapter of the work, which I take from the translation in use among Roman Catholics.

CHAP. I. SECT. I.

The Angels intercede for Man's redemption.

Mankind having for the long and tedious space of more than five thousand years continued in a miserable state of exile, *not one of them being able to shake off the clog of original guilt*, and soar to his native country, Heaven; the blessed choir of angelic spirits, (moved to compassion, and

concerned at the dreadful havoc sin had made among them, as well as solicitous to see the numbers of their own heavenly legions again completed,) as soon as the fulness of time was come, resolved *to renew the instances they had often before made to the Almighty*. For this end, presenting themselves before the awful throne of God, with redoubled earnestness and devotion, they jointly prostrated themselves at his feet, and made the following prayer: "All-merciful Lord! Remember how you graciously vouchsafed, from the inexhaustible fund of your goodness, to create man out of nothing, and to raise him above all the works of your sublunary creation, by enriching him with the eminent gift of a rational soul, capable of knowing you, and this on purpose that he might become a partaker of our felicity, and repair the loss we sustained by the fall of our reprobate brethren. Yet behold, O gracious Sovereign, the whole species lies still involved in such woeful ruin, that out of so great a number, *not one has been able to escape* and arrive hither in the long space of many thousand years. Our enemies thence gather new matter of triumph: when *instead of seeing the vacant places of the fallen angels filled, they behold hell continually crowded with innumerable victims:* to what end then are they created, O Lord? *Why are the souls that confess to you, delivered up a prey to beasts?* Psal. lxxiii. We are not ignorant, that this severity perfectly agrees with your divine justice; yet be pleased, O Lord, to remember, that the time for showing your mercy is come. If the first progenitors of the human race did unhappily transgress your law; let your mercy now repair the injury in their wretched posterity. Be mindful that you created them to your own likeness. Extend then in pity, O God, your hand to them, and replenish them with your bounty. To this end, "*Our eyes fixed on you, as the eyes of servants on the hands of their masters*, (Psal. cxxii.) till you deign to have compassion on mankind, and save them by a plentiful redemption."

SECT. II.

The angel having concluded this address, Mercy and Peace, supporting the petition in man's behalf, pathetically pleaded for his redemption with the heavenly Father: while Justice and Truth seemed to make a vigorous opposition against it; whence (for contemplation sake) *we may imagine a kind of ineffable debate* to arise between them, as St. Bernard relates in a beautiful and ample manner. But in this I shall be as concise as the tenour of our subject will permit. For though in this treatise, I intend often to interweave his words with my own, yet as our present purpose requires us to avoid tedious prolixity, I shall differ partly in the manner of applying them. To return then to our subject, the sum of his discourse, in the place above quoted, is as follows: Mercy, in the words of the royal prophet says, "Will God reject man for ever, or hath the Lord forgotten to show mercy?" Psal. lxxvi. Long and frequently importuned with these, and such like solicitations, thus at length, the Almighty may be supposed to have answered: "Hold, Mercy, before I acquiesce to your petitions, it becomes me as an equitable judge, to hear the allegations which Justice and Truth have to offer against them." Whereupon, the two divine attributes being ready to the summons, Mercy thus resumes: "Mankind, O Lord, stand in need of thy commiseration, for they are become wretched indeed, even extremely wretched; and the time for showing pity is more than come." Here Truth, interrupting the plea of Mercy, begins: "It is meet, O Lord, that you fulfil your divine word. Let Adam die, and all his race with him, since all, in him, impiously tasted the forbidden fruit." "Wherefore then, O Lord," replies Mercy, "wherefore do I subsist? if you forbear for ever to commiserate—there is an end of me: this, your Truth must acknowledge." "Yes," rejoins Truth, "but yet, O Eternal Father, if prevaricating man can elude your sentence, what becomes of me? Can I, as

you have promised, persist to eternity?" Thus the divine pleaders continuing to support their suit against each other,; *the Eternal Father, at length, remits the cause to his Son.* Before whom, Mercy and Truth renewing their former pleas, Truth thus added: "I confess, O Lord, that the zeal which Mercy exerts in man's behalf is good, and worthy all praise; but does she therein act comformably to justice, in persuading you rather to spare those prevaricators than me, her sister, attribute?" Ah, beloved Truth," replies Mercy, "rather consider, that your indignant rigour spares neither man nor me: by refusing to commiserate him, you involve me in his destruction, me, your sister Mercy." But Truth, unsoothed by all that Mercy could offer, still further urged: "You, O Lord, are here made a party in this cause, and therefore, it highly behoves you not to suffer the word of your Eternal Father to be made void." After this manner persisted *the divine parties* in opposing each other, till at length, all-uniting Peace, with her heavenly voice interposing, thus addressed them: "Cease to dispute, ye heavenly offspring of God, contention ill suits such kindred virtues." Still the debate was important, and the reasons on both sides so strong and powerful, that no means appeared of reconciling Mercy and Truth, in regard to mankind, till the divine and royal judge gave to Peace, who stood the nearest to his awful throne, the following ineffable decree to read, "Whereas, our Eternal Father's *divine offspring*, *Truth and Mercy*, have laid before us their opposite allegations concerning the salvation or perdition of our hapless creature, man; the former alleging, that, if the sentence of death passed upon Adam should be reversed, Mercy herself must be involved in the destruction of Adam. Our divine wisdom *suggests us* a medium to preserve both inviolable and uninjured. Let Death then be made a desirable good: That the apprehensions of all may be removed, and their ends obtained." No sooner was the

divine decree pronounced, than all, applauding its wisdom, silently consented that Adam should die, yet Death be a means of saving mercy to him. But hence, a new difficulty arose: How, O unsearchable wisdom, how shall Death become a desirable good to man, when the bare sound of it is sufficient to convey horror to the sense? "Know," answers the heavenly monarch, "that though the death of the wicked be superlatively wretched, that of the righteous is inestimably precious, and the sure entrance to eternal life. Let one then be sought out, who, though not by nature subject to death, will voluntarily submit to it, from a generous motive of disinterested charity. Such a one, not liable to be detained in subjection by death, will force a passage through it, and lead captivity after him to a blessed state of freedom. Here all acquiesce with pleasure to the divine proposal; yet where, say they, shall we be able to find such a one? Submissively, however, obsequious to the eternal word's decree, without waiting a reply, and paying due adoration to the Almighty Majesty, *both depart in search of him:* Truth resolving to range the earth, and Mercy the wide dominions of heaven, according to the words of the Prophet: Thy mercy, O Lord, is in heaven, and thy truth even to the clouds, (Psal. xxxv.) it encompasses the universe. Yet how vain, alas, their researches! Truth travelling round the world, finds no one free from guilt, not even the infant of a day old. And Mercy in vain seeks, throughout heaven, one who has charity equal to so great an undertaking. Alas! all mankind are but inferior servants, and the best of them must, even when they act well, say from St. Luke, (chap. xvii.,) that they are but unprofitable servants. As none, therefore, could be found so abounding in charity, as to lay down their life for such useless servants; it was to no purpose for Mercy and Truth to seek any longer. Hence returning to the Almighty's presence, at the appointed time, without the

desired success, Peace, with a benevolent countenance thus prevents them. Ah! heavenly sisters, know you not, or have you forgotten, that there is not one on earth who does good? No, not even one: Or who in heaven or on earth but he, whose wisdom gave you the ineffable advice you are endeavouring to follow, can assist you to effect it?" on hearing this, the all-wise Monarch spoke. "It repents me that I made man: Yet, as I have made him, it becomes the immensity of my goodness to do satisfaction for him. Wherefore," calling to him the angel Gabriel, "Go (says he) and tell the daughter of Sion: Behold your king comes." Thus far from St. Bernard. Hence you may see of how dangerous and fatal a consequence sin has been, and still is, and how great the difficulty of applying a remedy to it. To this purpose, however, the ABOVE-MENTIONED ATTRIBUTES SEEM BEST TO ACCORD AND UNITE IN THE PERSON OF GOD THE SON. For on one side, THE PERSON OF THE FATHER, BEARING IN APPEARANCE A TERRIBLE AND POWERFUL ASPECT, might seemingly give cause of apprehension for Peace and Mercy. On the other side, the person of the Holy Ghost, all bountiful and gracious, MIGHT SEEMINGLY GIVE NO LESS ROOM FOR APPREHENSION TO TRUTH AND JUSTICE. So that the person of the Son, between both, was wisely accepted as mediator in the important work. This, however, must be understood, *not in a strict sense, but a mystical and borrowed one.* Thus, then, was at length fulfilled that prophecy of the Psalmist, "Mercy and Truth met together, Justice and Peace kissed each other." Psal. lxxxiv.

This may suffice for *a pious meditation* on what, we may *devoutly conceive*, might probably pass in heaven, relating to man's redemption.—pp. 13—19.

Now really, to say nothing of the impiety and irreverence of such fictions, there is a considerable

quantity of doctrine involved in this extract, and of doctrine which, I should have thought, Mr. Oakeley himself would have considered erroneous and unscriptural. That the Incarnation is to be ascribed to the intercession of angels,—that for "*more than five* thousand years" preceding the Lord's coming, "*not one* of" the human race had been "able to shake off the clog of original guilt," or "to escape" from hell,—above all, that the mission of the Son of God was determined on, in consequence of *his* attributes *being different* from those of the Father and the Holy Spirit,—true or false, these statements involve *doctrine*, and will, I apprehend, be thought by most Christians to amount to something worse than, what Mr. Oakeley would call, "somewhat more extreme instances of the principle now sought to be vindicated, than, it was felt, would carry their own justification along with them, at least till the principle itself be more generally understood and recognised;"—which it is sincerely hoped it never may. But, of course, when catholicity is developed into the reception of all Romish doctrine *in globo*, and people think it necessary to disclaim any idea of criticising the writings or the conduct of canonized saints, as nothing short of presumption and irreverence, they will receive without examination many things at which other Christians would be shocked and startled. And so Mr. Oakeley, having omitted this extraordinary piece of profaneness, in-

stead of regretting that it was unfit for Christian eyes or ears, deems it necessary to make an apology to Bonaventure:—

> Perhaps *it may without presumption be hoped, that the blessed Saint with whose work these liberties have been unwillingly taken, will acquit, at least of all intentional irreverence towards himself, this seeming act of it;* hazarded, as it is, at all events in that spirit of charity which he illustrated, and with the hope of furthering those sacred ends of unity and peace, to which, as we cannot doubt, he would desire to contribute.—p. xxxi.

CHAPTER VI.

DOCTRINE OF THE SINLESS PERFECTION OF THE VIRGIN MARY —MR. OAKELEY'S MEDITATIONS—DR. PUSEY'S MEDITATION.

It will, I dare say, be remembered, that, in the account of the Purification, Mr. Oakeley has followed Bonaventure in his falsification of the Scripture, in order to make it square with the Romish doctrine of the immaculate holiness of the Virgin Mary. The notion he advances is, that the Virgin did not need purification.

> When the blessed Virgin had disposed of the treasures, she still remained, with her Divine Son Jesus, and her holy partner and protector, St. Joseph, in the humble shed at Bethlehem, waiting with patience in that miserable dwelling till the fortieth day from the Nativity, just as if *she* had been any ordinary mother, and her blessed Son any ordinary child, *subject to defilement, and so needing purification.* But because *they* would enjoy no special prerogatives, they *voluntarily, and without necessity, submitted to the law made for others.*—p. 41.

The reader will observe that in order to give an appearance of plausibility to this error, it is insinuated that the offering was made for the purification of the child as well as of the mother, without the slightest warrant for such a notion from Holy Scripture—the Purification being declared to be an atonement of a sin offering and burnt offering for

the mother, and not for the child.* But by misrepresenting it in this way as a purification both of child and mother,—it being plain that the Lord *needed* no purification nor atonement himself,—the reader hardly observes, that he is taught, by the very construction of the sentence, to regard the *mother* also as being neither subject to defilement nor needing purification. And thus the mind is quietly prepared to read without being shocked by it, the subsequent account which has been already transcribed, but which it is quite necessary should not be forgotten.

Consider each point attentively. The blessed Infant Jesus quietly remains upon the altar, like any other little child, and *with a look of intelligence beyond his years, fixes His eyes upon His Mother, and the rest who stand about Him, humbly waiting with patience, to see what more is to be done.* The priests enter solemnly with their attendants, and the Sovereign Lord of all things is redeemed like a slave at the low price of five pence, or five small pieces of coin called shekels, the sum given for other poor children.

What respect can Mr. Oakeley have for Holy Scripture? Is it conceivable that he could be so ignorant, as to suppose, either that a shekel was worth no more than a penny—or that the children of the poor were redeemed by a smaller sum than those of the rich? Impossible. Mr. Oakeley should know, that five shekels were more than ten shillings of our

* It is unnecessary here to enter into the question of the original text of St. Luke. Mr. Oakeley's position is not that *both* were purified, but that neither needed it.

money—and that this was the highest sum imposed by the Law; rich and poor having the same amount to pay. Bonaventure, in his zeal for the voluntary mendicancy of his order, wished to represent Joseph and Mary as being in the lowest state of abject poverty. Still one might have thought an English clergyman would have considered it worth while to correct such egregious blunders as these. But, shocking as the thought is, at every step one sees more reason to fear, that this party have lost all just perception of the sacredness of the inspired volume.

After Joseph had paid them to the priest, the blessed Mother joyfully received Him again into her arms. Then taking from Joseph the above-mentioned pair of pigeons, she knelt down, and lifting up her eyes devoutly to heaven, offered them, saying: "Vouchsafe, most merciful Father, to accept this offering, the first little gift which Thy beloved Son, of His extreme poverty, this day presents unto Thee!" Then *He, stretching forth His hands towards the little birds, raised His eyes to heaven, and though He said nothing, yet signified by his gestures that He offered them together with his Mother.* And so she left them upon the altar.

Consider here, Christian reader, and diligently contemplate the great dignity and majesty of those who make this offering: the blessed Virgin Mother, and her Divine Son, Jesus. Could such an offering, think you, though a little one, be rejected of God? No; rather may we devoutly suppose it to have been carried up to heaven by the hands of Angels, and there presented by them, and to have been most graciously accepted, at the Eternal Throne, amidst the joyful thanksgivings of the whole company of blessed spirits.—pp. 45, 46.

The turtle doves, it seems then, or young pigeons, were not a sin offering and burnt offering to cleanse the mother and make an atonement for her, as the word of God declares them to have been. *This* mother was subject to no defilement, and needed no purification nor atonement; and whatever the readers of Holy Scripture may have learned from the oracles of God, they are now required *piously* to believe that, in offering this sacrifice, the Virgin "voluntarily, and without necessity, submitted to the law made for others." Nay, to make this error still more plausible, the propitiatory and purifying character of the ceremony is kept wholly out of sight, and the offering is represented as a "*little gift*," which the Son of God "presents" to his Heavenly Father, "together with His mother." This is nothing less than a direct falsification of the Holy Scripture *for a purpose.*

But, if Mr. Oakeley and Bonaventure may piously meditate in this fashion, why may not others treat the same subject in a different way? Dr. Pusey, who has his own peculiar part in "the blessed work" of Romanizing the church of England, has given quite another colour to the story. Even the *facts* he represents differently. According to Mr. Oakeley and Bonaventure, we are to suppose that *pigeons* were offered.

> But, as they were poorer even than most, we may rather suppose, that their offering, consisted only of *two pigeons*, which were of less price than the doves; and for that reason are mentioned the last in the Law.—p. 43.

Dr. Pusey, however, decides, but without stating his reasons, that the offering was "two *turtle-doves*." But besides this, they differ altogether as to *the intention* of the offering. This is Dr. Pusey's account of the matter:—

THE REDEEMER REDEEMED.

The title of Redeemer is one of the most glorious attributes of GOD, and the Name which He takes, and which the Prophets often give Him in the Old Testament, in order to inspire men with respect, with thankfulness, with confidence, and with love. "Thou, O Lord, art my Helper and my Redeemer," said the Prophet. (P. xix. 14.) "Our Redeemer, the Lord of Hosts is His Name, the Holy One of Israel," (Isa. xlvii. 4,) said the Prophet Isaiah, and in the same spirit it was that the priest Zachariah, perceiving that JESUS CHRIST was about to be born of Mary, acknowledged Him before He appeared upon earth, as the Redeemer of Israel, exclaiming, in his sacred canticle, "Blessed be the Lord GOD of Israel, for He hath visited and redeemed His people." (Luke, i. 68.)

Truly it was needful, says St. Augustine, that the WORD of GOD, by Whom the whole world was made, should also come to redeem the world; but in order that His Love should shine forth with new glory, He was not content with having fulfilled that glorious office, but *He willed also to put Himself in such a position as to be Himself redeemed*, in order the more efficaciously to perform the function of a Redeemer. He made Himself man to redeem all men; He took the form of a servant, to redeem us from slavery; He took the appearance of a sinner, and really laid upon Himself our sins, that He might redeem us from our sins, and from the punishments which were due to them; finally, He became subject unto death, that He might redeem us from death. (Idem. in Ps. 50.) What greater mercy can be conceived, says Cassidore! What a wondrous redemption, what a miracle of love, to

see *a Creator created*, a King serving, a Redeemer sold, Greatness Itself brought low, and the Author of life submitting to death! And at what a price! That of His Blood! "Ye know," said the chief of the Apostles, (1 Pet. i. 18, 19,) "that ye were not redeemed with corruptible things as silver and gold, but with the precious Blood of Christ."

Scarcely will this Divine Redeemer appear in the world, than He will Himself be redeemed, in the way of His own appointment, and by His own creatures. Herod will seek for him to put Him to death, and He will owe His life to Joseph, who will save his Saviour by his flight into Egypt; He will be presented in the Temple, and *Mary His holy Mother will redeem His liberty by two turtle doves.*—Guide for Passing Advent, pp. 35—37.

So that, according to Dr. Pusey, two *turtle-doves* were offered by the Virgin Mary, and these, not at all as an offering or atonement for herself, but as the sacrifice by which the Son of God was redeemed by his mother. Mr. Oakeley, on the contrary, will teach us to piously believe, that there were no *doves* offered, but *pigeons*,* and that the offering was not

* In the Roman-catholic translation of Bonaventure, which forms the staple of Mr. Oakeley's work, in the commencement of this meditation it is said that *pigeons* were bought as being "of a less price than doves." But afterwards the translator talks of the above-mentioned pair of *turtles*, which Mr. Oakeley alters, as we have seen, to "*pigeons*," and, in conclusion, "stretching forth his hands towards the *doves*," which Mr. Oakeley changes to "little birds." I observe this, not to point out the inconsistency of the Roman-catholic translators —but to notice the fact that Mr. Oakeley has corrected these blunders, while he retains the strange absurdity of reckoning the shekel to be worth no more than a penny—as well as the misstatement that five shekels was the sum given by the poor.

a *redemption* or *atonement* of any sort, but merely a "*first little gift*,"* presented by Christ and the Virgin conjointly, as an offering of the Son of God to his heavenly Father, "together with his mother." Which of the two versions is less respectful to the word of God, or does greater violence to the sacred text, it is hard to determine. But in one point they both agree; and it is a remarkable one,—that, whether the offering consisted of doves or pigeons, it was not offered as an atonement for the cleansing of the Virgin Mary.

* This is the term used by the Roman-catholic translator also.

CHAPTER VII.

FANATICISM—SPECIMENS FROM DR. PUSEY'S ADAPTATION OF AVRILLON'S GUIDE FOR PASSING ADVENT HOLILY.

WHERE is this tampering with truth—this irreverence for the Holy Scripture—to end? In Dr. Pusey it has at last arrived at a degree of fanaticism, almost incredible in a person of his education. This assertion would need no further proof than the extracts I have already given from his preface to Surin; and if any one considers the word "*fanaticism*" too strong a term to describe such writing, I should be glad to know what other term to apply to it. But if any person still doubts, the work from which the foregoing extract has been made will, I conceive, place the matter beyond question. This volume is called

A guide for passing Advent holily, in which is found for each day, a practice, meditation, thoughts upon portions of Holy Scriptures for the season, sentences from the Holy Scriptures and the Fathers; and one point in the Incarnation. By Avrillon. Translated from the French, and adapted to the use of the English Church.—

There is prefixed a preface of fifty-eight pages, signed E. B. P., and dated, Christ Church, Twenty-fourth Sunday after Trinity, 1844.* The very table of contents is a proof of the fanatical character of the work. For, what can be a more certain symp-

* In the Morning Post for Dec. 4, 1845, this book is advertised with Dr. Pusey's name—as a "Devotional Work for Advent, lately published."

tom of fanaticism, than a propensity to speak of sacred persons and subjects in coarse and offensive terms?—such, for example, as the revolting language which Dr. Pusey has held up to admiration, as specimens of Christian and saintly humility, in the passage I have quoted from his preface to Surin. A few extracts from this table of contents will explain what I mean without necessity of comment.

"An avenging God *become loving*."—"The Redeemer redeemed."—"A Spirit become flesh."—"Immensity enclosed."—"The Creator become a creature."—"Uncreated Wisdom become foolishness."—"The Almighty in weakness."—"Homage to the mind of the Infant Jesus in the Manger."—"Homage to the Adorable Heart of Jesus in the cradle."—"An innocent penitent."—"Homage to the Adorable Heart of Jesus in the manger."—"Homage to the Sacred Hands of Jesus in the cradle."—"Homage to the Adorable Eyes of Jesus in the manger."—"Homage to the Sacred Feet of Jesus in the Manger."—"Homage to the Adorable Flesh of Jesus in the Manger."—"God a babe."—"Homage to the Blood of Jesus Christ in the Manger."—"An annihilated God."—"Homage to the Soul of the new-born Jesus."

Now, really, I do not wish to think harshly, or to speak disrespectfully of any man. But I cannot understand the state of mind which could put such language as this into print. Some centuries ago, when men, perhaps unconsciously, affected paradox, I can imagine such language as this being nothing worse than the bad taste of the time. But those times are past; and for a divine of some learning, educated amongst scholars and gentlemen, to prefer a coarse and disgusting style in his treatment of

sacred subjects, is unnatural; and when we recollect all that has been written by the party,—and by none in that party more than by Dr. Pusey himself,—on trembling reverence and reserve, and then find him adopting the most offensive characteristics of Romish fanaticism, it is impossible to overlook so remarkable a feature in the movement in which he has always taken so conspicuous and prominent a part. And this sort of language, be it observed, he states, is adapted to the use of the English church.

In order to understand the line Dr. Pusey is now taking, it will be necessary to lay some extracts from this work before the reader.

IMMENSITY ENCLOSED.

The immensity of GOD, by which HE fills all things and is in all things, is one of the most glorious Properties of His Supreme Being, and one of the most glorious attributes of His Divinity; the vast expanse of earth, of sea, of heaven, can neither contain nor enclose Him, nor put any bounds to His Immensity. A truth so immoveable, that it was even known by the philosophers whom St. Paul was willing to quote, before those learned Areopagites who might have contradicted him, had they not themselves learnt it; "for in HIM," says that great apostle, "we live, and move, and have our being." He is within all things without being enclosed in them; He is above and around all things without being excluded from them, because His Being is an indivisible Whole, and a Whole universally spread abroad without being composed of parts.

It is then through the infinite love which the WORD of GOD bears towards men, that he has been pleased *to put bounds to His Immensity*, through the mystery of the In-

carnation, and that this "*contracted Word*," as the holy fathers call Him, allows a Body to be formed for Himself from the pure blood of a Virgin, wherein *He finds the secret of wholly enclosing His Divinity;* for what is more little than the but-just formed body of a child, and yet *It contains That wholly* which Heaven and earth cannot contain? Let us here extend our reflections still further, and reflect with deep attention, that in this little Infant Body resides a Mind, and in this Mind there is a mine of science and of wisdom, and all the brightest and most piercing light of the Divinity, which are there shut up and eclipsed in such wise, that nought thereof may outwardly appear. Let us go still further, and let us reflect, that in that little body, limited on all sides, is also found a Heart, and that that Heart, so soon as formed, has become the chief seat of Divine love, with all its Divine Fire, capable of enkindling all other hearts, and that it is obliged to restrain all those manifestations by which it might burst forth.

This little Body, formed by the Hand of the Holy Ghost, wherein dwells all the fulness of the Divinity, is as yet still enclosed in the Virgin's womb, and will be there during nine months, without occupying a larger space, despite His unbounded Greatness. O, wondrous prodigy! which caused one to exclaim: "*Sacred womb of Mary, thou art more vast than Heaven, thou art of more wondrous comprehension than the universe, since Thou enclosest Him Who encloseth all, and the King of Glory reposeth in thee.*" —pp. 99—101.

Now, the effect on most minds of having such writings put into their hands will inevitably be, either to disgust them, and possibly, diminish their reverence for sacred things,—or else to lead them to positively erroneous notions of the Incarnation. "Immensity enclosed" is not a mystery. It is a contradiction in terms: the conjunction of ideas in-

compatible. And the consequence will inevitably be, either men will be led to deny the deity of the Son of God, or to believe that it was the divine *nature* which suffered. The subject is too mysterious to be consigned to the irreverence and indiscretion of an unchastised imagination. Nothing, however, is more remarkable in this passage than the manner in which a position, which professes to honour the Redeemer, is made use of chiefly as a foundation for a superstitious and all but idolatrous address to the Virgin. Coming from Dr. Pusey, this is every way remarkable.

I shall extract another example from the sixteenth point in the incarnation. "The immortal subject to death."

But, O my GOD, HOW STRANGE A FALL DIDST THOU UNDERGO in the mystery of the Incarnation! But CAN GOD FALL? YES, IN ONE SENSE, HE CAN: His love for man can alone abase the Supreme Being, can disarm the Almighty, can wound the Eternal, can *cause the Immortal* GOD *to die*.

The oneness of HIS DIVINE NATURE, *His immutability, His impeccability, which are the principles of His immortality, are here about to disappear*, and He sacrificeth all the glory of them in becoming man. His *Oneness suffereth* because he taketh a nature composed of body and of soul, of flesh and of blood; and in espousing these, He espouseth also the seeds of death. His *immutability suffereth*, because He is about to endure all the changes to which man is subject; heat, cold, hunger, thirst, weariness, joy, sorrow, fear, grief, and, above all, death, which is the change which humbleth man beyond all others. His *impeccability suffereth*, because He is about to take upon

Himself the sins of all men, to take all the appearances, to endure all the ignominies, and even the death of a sinner; death, which is so much the more full of shame, as being the punishment and wages of sin, even as by sin alone has it been brought into the world. He is about to be born, and to be born mortal, for the birth of man has death for its destination: he beginneth to hasten to his grave as soon as he is formed. Behold *the sad heritage of an immortal* GOD!—pp. 114, 115.

It is really no apology for such writing as this, to say that Dr. Pusey himself *does not intend* to be profane, or to teach men impiety. The terms used are not such as ought to be applied to the Almighty. They require to be explained away, to prevent them from being as blasphemous as they sound. To say that God can fall is untrue. To say that the oneness, the immutability, and the impeccability of the *Divine nature* can suffer, is untrue; and how any *sane* person, that retains a particle of the fear of God, can feel any desire to say such things,—or can imagine, for a moment, that he does good to himself or any one else by saying them,—is inexplicable.

THE CREATOR BECOME A CREATURE.

GOD is the Creator of this vast universe, and of all creatures visible and invisible inhabiting it; He has *created all* with the greatest ease, by a single word, *nay, in sport*, according to the language of Scripture, "disporting in the habitable part of the world;" ludens in orbe terrarum, (Prov. viii. 31;) and by this *awfully great and Divine disporting*, did all things proceed easily from His Adorable Hand; and thus was His Infinite Greatness and our dependence established; for verily thus to bring all things

out of nothing, as He has done, is the most authentic proof of His Almightiness and of His Divinity.—p. 120.

I hope it is needless to point out the infinite impropriety of such language, unbecoming the lips of an archangel. Those whose instinctive reverence does not revolt from such terms being applied to God, are but little likely to understand the feeling of horror they excite in a sound mind.

What follows may serve as further specimens of the fanaticism of this volume. They occurs in the directions to celebrate the nine days before Christmas, which, according to Dr. Pusey, we are to observe, "in order to honour the nine months during which our Adorable Saviour was shut up in the sacred womb of his *Divine* mother."

That thou mayest enter into the spirit of this deep devotion, it will be well for thee to offer daily a particular homage to JESUS CHRIST, as lying in the stable of Bethlehem; on the first of these nine days (which is to-day) this homage is to be paid to the Mind of that Adorable Saviour enclosed in an Infant's body; on the second thou wilt offer it to His Heart, on the third to His Mouth, on the fourth to His Eyes, on the fifth to His Hands, on the sixth to His Feet, on the seventh to His Flesh, on the eighth to His Soul, and on the ninth to His Divinity.—p. 138.

Some of these acts of homage it will be proper to transcribe:—

HOMAGE TO THE ADORABLE HEART OF JESUS IN THE CRADLE.

O Adorable Heart of my JESUS, the only Object of all my tender affections, the *delicious Centre of all my desires*,

in which so many mysteries of love have already passed, *since the* Holy Spirit *formed Thee of the pure blood of Mary*, and during that space of nine months for which Thou hast been shut up in her chaste womb, I offer Thee all the most respectful and most loving homage of my heart. Thou art close locked within the bosom of a Babe, which hideth from us Thine ardent love; nevertheless, thou burnest with love incomprehensible for Thy Heavenly Father, and Thou offerest Him an infinite and surpassingly meritorious homage and adoration; Thou art enkindled too, with love for men, for, to save them, Thou sacrificest Thyself; to this sacrifice do I unite myself with my whole heart, both for time and for eternity.—pp. 153, 154.

HOMAGE TO THE ADORABLE MOUTH OF JESUS IN THE MANGER.

Divine and Infant Mouth of my Divine Saviour, Source of the most pure delights, sacred Lips upon which all grace is shed, which have spoken by the Prophets, and were formed by the Holy Ghost, only that they might pronounce those oracles of wisdom and laws of holiness which form both the happiness and the security of those who hear and practise them, only that They might give proofs of the graciousness and loving-kindness of Thy Heart, and pronounce the merciful sentence of life and pardon to all who have recourse to Thee; I adore Thee in the womb of Thy holy Mother, where Thou keepest unbroken silence, and in the Manger where Thou explainest Thyself but by Thine Infant Cries. O Adorable Mouth, consecrate mine, that henceforth it may be occupied only with the Divine mercies of my Saviour. Render it worthy, O my God, to approach Thine with reverence and purity, and to say to Thee with like confidence as the Spouse in the sacred Canticles: "Let Him kiss me, with the kisses of His Mouth." Osculetur me, osculo oris sui. (Song Sol. i. 2.)—pp. 160, 161.

Is there any warrant in Scripture,—in reason,—

in antiquity,—for addressing prayers like these to the parts and members of the Lord's body? Is it a natural feeling of Christian piety to offer up prayers to the Lord as if he were still unborn? Can such prayers be anything short of solemn falsehood?

O Lord, with a heart penetrated with sorrow, I humbly ask pardon of Thee, for I have offended Thee by transgressing Thy holy Laws; I ask healing of Thee, as of the true Physician of my soul, which hath inflicted on herself as many wounds as she hath committed sins. *Ransom me anew*, O Divine Deliverer, and *renew* for my sake *the redemption* which Thou didst begin in the Cradle and didst consummate upon the Cross, for my sin hath made me fall under the most shameful of all bondage; absolve me, unloose me, break the chains which hold my soul captive, and restore me the liberty which I have lost by my sin: *be my Surety; pay for me*, for, alas! I confess myself utterly destitute; and as Thou art my Saviour, a single drop of Thy Blood can acquit me of all I owe Thy Justice: cover my sins, hide them, if it be possible, from Thine Own Eyes: reclothe me, for I am naked, and my sin hath wholly stripped me, and cover me with the precious Garments of Grace and Righteousness.—pp. 164, 165.

Is it true, that a human soul can be ransomed anew? Is it true, that the redemption consummated upon the Cross can be renewed, or requires to be renewed? Is there any sense or meaning in asking the Lord to be our surety, or to pay for us, as if that still remained to be done? Such prayers must either be heresy and falsehood, or else simple nonsense and fanaticism.

HOMAGE TO THE SACRED HANDS OF JESUS IN THE CRADLE.

Is it an Almighty GOD Whom I approach to adore? Those feeble Hands I see, are they those of GOD Who hath made all things out of nothing? of GOD Who so well knows how to cast forth the thunder and the Thunderbolts, that He may hurl them upon the guilty heads of His enemies? of a sovereign, Whose Hands are the disposers of sceptres and of crowns, and have power to overthrow them when it pleaseth Him? Yes, O LORD, Thy Hands, weak in appearance, which I see now enveloped in swaddling clothes, and now spread out upon Thy Cradle, are able, if Thou willest, to overthrow Heaven and earth: but they are weak like those of other children, because it is Thy Will, and for my sake. O infant Hands, O sacred Hands, Dispensers of all the treasures of grace and of glory, I adore You, but grant me all the help I need in order to assure my salvation.—p. 168.

HOMAGE TO THE ADORABLE EYES OF JESUS IN THE MANGER.

Thine Eyes shed Tears, O Divine Babe; is it not through a feeling of humility, and because Thou willest to be conformed to other children who weep when born? Is it not pain also which causeth Thee to shed them, because Thou art in an uncovered shed, and the severity of the season maketh Thee suffer? But is it not through a feeling of love and of tenderness, and because my miseries touch Thy Heart?

But, O Adorable Babe! I greatly fear lest rather it be a sad foreboding of my unfaithfulness and of mine ingratitude, which draweth them from Thine Eyes.

O precious Tears of my JESUS, flow on, yea, flow onwards even unto Heaven, reach even to the Heart of the Father of Heaven, that ye may extinguish the fire of His Wrath too justly enkindled against me; descend even to Hell, that ye may there extinguish the devouring flames which I have deserved: but, above all, come and sprinkle

our hearts, that ye may banish all dryness thence, may soften their hardness, may wash them, may purify them, may make them bring forth good fruit an hundred fold: come, lastly, that ye may consecrate them, may kindle them, and may unite them inseparably to the sacred heart of JESUS.—pp. 175, 176.

HOMAGE TO THE SACRED FEET OF JESUS IN THE MANGER.

O sacred Feet of mine infant JESUS! of my King, my Saviour, and my GOD, I adore you, and I should count myself indeed happy might I kiss you reverently with my lips. Although ye appear in exceeding weakness, and are wrapped about with mean swaddling clothes, yet I adore beforehand the precious and sacred footsteps which ye will print upon the earth; still more blessed were I, if, whilst adoring them with lowly reverence and lively faith, I might ever follow them unswervingly, since they would ever trace for me the road which leads to glory.

O infant feet of mine adorable Saviour! ye are soon about to sustain the Body of that GOD Who alone upholdeth heaven and earth; ye are about to bear Him to the conquest of those souls which He will redeem with His most precious blood. But, alas! my heart is pierced with grief when I think that when those infant Feet shall have acquired their proper size, they will be transfixed to a cross, pierced with nails, and cruelly torn, since they will sustain the whole weight of the Body of my dying SAVIOUR, and that from them will flow a river of blood, which will bedew the Cross to which they will be transfixed, and Calvary, for my sake.—p. 183.

HOMAGE TO THE ADORABLE FLESH OF JESUS CHRIST IN THE MANGER.

O Adorable Flesh of my JESUS, chaste production of GOD a pure Spirit, and of *a Virgin made more pure than Angels;* Flesh *human at once and Deified;* human, because like ours; Divine, because the fulness of the

Divinity inhabiteth therein ; I adore Thee with my whole heart, and I offer to Thee my most humble and most loving homage.

I adore Thee within the sacred womb of Thy holy Mother, where Thou wast formed from her most pure blood, through the ineffable operation of the HOLY GHOST, and where Thou hast been enclosed during the space of nine months for my sake. I adore Thee in the stable and in the manger, where Thou sufferest the hardships of cold, that Thou mightest save me from the sufferings I have deserved. Thou art about to "grow in stature" through the nourishment Thou wilt receive from a Virgin Mother, and I sigh for the time of Thy manhood, that my blessedness may be hastened; but I fear it also, for when Thou shalt have attained Thy full greatness, Thou wilt be pierced and torn for my sins.

O Adorable and Virgin Flesh of my JESUS, purify, consecrate mine ; "preserve" it from all corruption, that so it may rise again glorious and incorruptible.—pp. 190, 191.

HOMAGE TO THE BLOOD OF JESUS CHRIST IN THE MANGER.

O Adorable Blood, Who beginnest to flow in the Veins of my JESUS, Which sustainest the Life of that Adorable Saviour in the stable, and which wilt sustain It during thirty and three years, until the sad moment marked out in the decrees of GOD, wherein It will be poured out for the salvation of mankind ; I adore Thee with my whole heart : flow then within those infant Veins and beneath that tender Flesh, to quicken It, and to lead It on towards Its perfect growth : I have a right over every drop of which Thou art composed, for Thou art the price of my ransom, the sacred material and the glorious instrument of my redemption.

O Adorable Blood, Thou burnest with ardent zeal to be shed, without delay, in order to hasten my bliss ; but my Saviour Who, according to the sure word of the Pro-

phet, wills that my redemption should be "plenteous," waiteth until His Veins be enlarged by the succession of years, that so They may contain and pour forth a greater abundance of it. But, alas! I shudder when I think that the Blood of this Saving God, Whom I adore, will be one day drawn from His Veins upon Calvary by the cruelty of the executioner: but that which is the cause of my fear and grief is also that of my hope and of my eternal happiness.—p. 198.

HOMAGE TO THE SOUL OF JESUS IN THE MANGER.

I adore Thee, O All-holy Soul of my Infant Saviour, and my whole soul consecrates herself to Thee for ever: Thou art the purest, the most perfect, and the most sublime production which hath ever come forth from the Hand of the Holy Ghost, Who united Thee to the Adorable Body of Jesus Christ, when forming It of the most pure blood of a Virgin; and He placed Thee in that Body, which was the master-piece of His Power, of His Grace, and of His Love, in order to give It Life, and thus to consummate the ineffable mystery of our Redemption.

O wholly Adorable Soul of my Divine Saviour, *Thou hadst then, yea, from that first moment, the perfect use of reason*, albeit Thou wast enclosed within a small Body, but lately formed and *placed in* the sacred womb of Mary; Thou thoughtest then, and in a manner infinitely sublime; Thou adoredst the Father of Heaven, and in a way worthy of Him; Thou lovedst Him with an infinite love, and as much as He is the object of love; Thou didst already accept for my sake the humbled state to which Thou wast reduced, and the hardships to which Thou wast about to be exposed in the stable and in the crib, and the numerous woes of the three and thirty years of Thy mortal Life, the persecutions which Thou wast to suffer from the Jews; in a word, Thou didst accept the sacrifice of the Cross, that most bitter and most shameful Death, that Thou mightest redeem me at the price of all Thy Blood. I owe

my redemption, then, to Thee, O all-holy Soul! accept, therefore, the sacrifice of mine wholly; I consecrate it to Thee; accept it, purify it, enlighten it, sanctify it, and make it worthy to love Thee eternally in Heaven.—pp. 204, 205.

My object in quoting all these passages is, to guard against any one's supposing, that I am carping at passing expressions and incautious words—though words and expressions should be weighed in gold scales, when men undertake to guide their fellow sinners in their approaches to the throne of grace. But, here are specimens long and frequent enough, to put the reader fully and fairly in possession of the sort of piety which Dr. Pusey, and the party with whom he acts, are endeavouring to substitute for the piety of the church of England. Be this Romanism or not, it is fanaticism. It teaches men to use in their solemn prayers language which is untrue; and really, how the Catholic faith of the Incarnation can survive, if such books obtain general circulation and use, is more than I am able to understand.

HOMAGE TO THE DIVINITY OF JESUS IN THE MANGER.

O ye powers of Heaven, ye Cherubim shining with light, ye Seraphim burning with the most fervent and the purest love, impart to me both your light and your zeal, that I may know, that I may love, that I may adore within the Manger that same DEITY, to Whom Ye incessantly offer your homage and your adorations in Heaven; the DEITY in a Stable which serves Him as a palace, in a Manger which serves Him as a throne, in mortal Flesh and in the newly-

formed Body of a Babe, which serves Him as a Sanctuary, and *between two beasts*, which serve as attendants upon the King of Kings: God Almighty, enclosed and hidden under so many veils, He Who filled Heaven and earth, O unheard-of prodigy! O Miracle of miracles! O ecstasy! O transport! which ought to overwhelm and rejoice all mortals, because for their sakes it is, and on their behalf, that God has willed to bring it to pass, and that the God of mercy hath become man, in order that of men He should make gods.—pp. 211, 212.

Now what is the meaning of such language as this? Does Dr. Pusey seriously mean to pray to the angels to inspire him with the love of God? Does he mean *to teach others* to pray in this manner? Or if not, with all the experience of the church before him, and the tendency of human nature to idolatry recorded in every page of the church's history, what is to be thought of such fearful trifling with the safety of human souls?

A word or two is sometimes sufficient to show the tendencies of a system. Who told Dr. Pusey, that the Lord lay "between two beasts?" Does he really believe it a matter of indifference, whether the statements he makes, and teaches others to make, *in prayer*, have any foundation in truth or not?

CHAPTER VIII.

THE PROGRESS OF ERROR—FURTHER PROOFS OF THE FANATICISM OF DR. PUSEY'S TEACHING—HIS ADAPTATION OF AVRILLON'S YEAR OF AFFECTIONS.

THERE are particular doctrines advocated in this work of Dr. Pusey's which will require consideration hereafter. Doctrines and language, from which his party would, sometime ago, have recoiled with horror, and which, had any one accused them of, the accusation would have been treated as a slander, are now not only tolerated, but there is evidently a formed and deliberate design to familiarize them to the minds of the members of our church. Of these, the doctrine and language of Dr. Pusey, regarding the Virgin Mary, are such as will require a more lengthened exposure. What I particularly refer to is the superstitious reverence for the Virgin Mary, and the erroneous doctrines regarding her, which Dr. Pusey is now labouring to inculcate. There was a time when we might have hoped better. But the progress of error is steep and rapid. Nor is it possible to say, how deep may be the descent of him who trifles with truth in any one particular. And if men will allow themselves such liberties in their devotional exercises, and in their expositions and applications of the words of the living God, as no man would dare to venture on, in his use of the words of an earthly superior,

and no honest man would dream of using in the ordinary transactions of life, or in the treatment of a document which concerned his dealings with his fellow-men, surely, we need not be surprised at any amount of error into which they may be suffered to fall. And, indeed, as there is an inseparable connexion between the several parts of truth and articles of faith, and he who thoughtfully embraces one, is prepared to embrace the rest in due order, according to the degree of attention and integrity with which he approaches the school of truth—so in the school of error—there is an inseparable connexion of falsehood; and he who has habituated his mind to the first lessons of untruth and self-delusion, is prepared to imbibe all sorts of errors and heresies, and the measure of his departure from orthodoxy is more commonly determined by adventitious and external circumstances than by any other cause. Even to connive at error, and to keep silence when truth should be defended and falsehood rebuked, has a tendency too seldom suspected, and is the symptom of a disease which seldom ends where it has begun.

But just now, we have rather to do with the fanaticism which is developing itself among the leaders of this party;—and that, I apprehend, in nearer connexion with the works and practices of the Jesuits than the public has yet been made aware of. One of the latest of Dr. Pusey's works is another volume

in this same series, a translation of a second work of Avrillon, "The Year of Affections, or Affections on the Love of God, drawn from the Canticles, for every day in the year. By Avrillon. Translated from the French, and adapted to the use of the English church." I shall probably have occasion to revert to this work hereafter for another purpose, but at present I refer to it as affording specimens of this new school of fanaticism in the church of England. I suppose there is no one book in existence on which fanatics of every age have been fonder of exercising their enthusiasm than that which the sobriety of true devotion and humility,—and it may be added of true catholicity,—has ever approached with fear and cautious reverence—the Song of Solomon. To attempt here to enter on the true mode of considering and expounding the language, with which the Lord communes with his church in that mysterious canticle, would be impossible. But this much may safely be said: that, if there be one employment more mischievous than another, it is teaching beginners to throw the reins on their ill-governed fancy, and to make the words of that song whose meaning no man yet (it may well be doubted) has ever been able to learn, the sport of a youthful and excited imagination,—and, by means of extravagant perversions and misapplications, to torture language which can apply only to the church, into the expression of the almost sensual feelings of a heated en-

thusiasm. It is impossible to open this volume of Dr. Pusey's, and to reflect on the hands it must fall into, and on the use that will be made of it, if it be circulated and used at all, without such feelings of horror as do not admit of being expressed in words. A few examples must suffice for the present.

Terribilis ut castrorum acies ordinata.

There is no man who has not his weak side, by which the devil beats out for himself a road into his heart, by which he may bring in corruption; and *this weak side is a ruling imperfection*, which is most commonly the ground which he has to contest, and which he ought to make the subject of his fears and precautions. But it is wonderful, O GOD of strength, that *Thou hast Thy weakness as well as mortals*. But Thy Apostles teach us that this weakness is stronger than the strength of all men together. (1 Cor. i. 25.) Thou hast vouchsafed to reveal it to me, *to give me an advantage over Thee*, by making known to me that *this Divine and Almighty weakness* is nothing but the love which Thou hast for me. This is the weakness which conquers the strong man and even strength itself. Love is, then, stronger than an army in battle array, since by it *I can take my God on His weak side*, and by it He suffers me to wrest from His Hand the thunderbolt which was ready to crush the sinner. It is, then, *by the strength of my love that I shall have a hold upon the Heart of my Creator and my Judge, that I can incline Him towards me, and make Him propitious to me.* Since I know this I should be very miserable if I did not avail myself of it.—pp. 105, 106.

I pretend not to say, to what a pitch of enthusiasm the exercises of a Jesuit noviciate may exalt the imagination, during that terrible process of fusion, by which the human soul is gradually re-

duced to the consistency required by those who require the machinery of living corpses to effect their purposes. But looking to the members of *our church*, for whom Dr. Pusey has prepared this book, I would ask, whether it is possible to believe, that anything short of mental derangement could render such language endurable to any one that feared God, or had real humility and contrition of spirit? To comment on such a passage would be an affront to piety.

If there be any subject which a truly catholic mind will desire to approach with caution and reverence, it is that of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper—and on no other subject, next to the nature and attributes of the Divine being, is true wisdom more careful and exact in confining itself as much as possible to the very words and phraseology of the scripture and the church. I would ask my reader to imagine such language as the following in the mouth of young and excitable persons:—

FIFTH DAY.

Quis mihi det te fratrem meum sugentem ubera matris meæ? (Cant. viii.)

O that Thou wert as my brother, that sucked the breasts of my mother! said the bride. *My sympathetic love.* LORD, delights not to see Thee always seated on the Throne of Thy Majesty, nor armed with thunderbolts, ready to crush the guilty, nor as the LORD of Hosts, subduing the nations which are Thy enemies: Love does Thee more honour; and it is more in accordance with the inclinations of Thy Heart than fear. I desire to love Thee as a Brother *with Whom I partake of the same milk and the same Blood;*

I desire like the bride, to caress Thee, as an infant brother who sucks the breasts of my mother Love has humbled Thee even to take upon Thyself this low estate, in order to render Thee nearer, lovelier, and better suited to me; I am permitted to seek Thee out of Heaven, and in the Manger to adore Thy Divine Infancy, and to embrace Thee, like this favoured spouse, with the utmost reverence and tenderness of which I am capable.

SIXTH DAY.

Quis mihi det te fratrem meum, &c.

It is at the Holy Table that I perceive in Thee, Heavenly Bridegroom, all the tenderness and the sympathy of an affectionate Brother. Thou givest me there Thy Flesh, Thy Blood, Thy Heart, Thy Spirit, and Thy Soul: Thy Flesh sanctifies mine, Thy Blood purifies and consecrates mine; my heart is inflamed by Thine, and *Thy Soul a second time* quickens and *redeems mine:* there all that is Thine becomes mine, and I am transformed into Thee. Desire then, ardently, O my soul, to draw near to *This Divine Brother, This Adorable Bridegroom, to give Him the chaste kiss of a sister and a spouse, and to stain thy lips with His Blood; there caress tenderly this Infant Brother,* WHO ABRIDGES HIS IMMENSITY THAT HE MAY BE CONTAINED IN THE ELEMENTS; there suck the milk of the children of GOD, which is the grace of the Sacrament; run eagerly to feed on this most pure Flesh. The more worthily thou receivest It, *the more wilt thou strengthen thy Sympathy with this Adorable Brother,* Who is thy Spouse and Thy GOD; and the impression which He will make in thee will render thee firm against the torrent of vice.—pp. 273, 274.

The familiarity of this language is perfectly shocking. And besides this, is it not palpable, that, if it be proper in any sinful creature to address such language to our blessed Redeemer, it is not one in a

million, even of honest Christians, that can use such vehement and impassionate expressions without actual untruth? But what church will own as orthodox the expression Dr. Pusey has here used?

WHO ABRIDGES HIS IMMENSITY THAT HE MAY BE CONTAINED IN THE ELEMENTS.

Certainly, not the church of England for one. And if this be not the doctrine of our church, am I not justified in asking, likewise, whether the following bears any resemblance to her chastised devotion?—

FAMILIAR LOVE.

A common charity truly renders the soul pleasing to God; but a perfect charity *affectionately constrains this Supreme Greatness to descend from the Throne of His Majesty in order to become familiar with a bride*, and to bind Himself in close affection with her. All that can be said of the strongest affections does not approach to that between GOD and the soul which loves Him heartily. These affections are considered to consist either in *the pleasure of conversation, in the communication of secrets, in reciprocal liberality*, in conformity of sentiments, or in courage to suffer all things for one another. But, in the first place, what is more familiar and tender than the converse between GOD and the soul which loves Him Alone? What outpourings of heart! what Divine caresses! what chaste pleasures! what *reciprocal complacencies!* In the second place, *what secrets does He not confide to her, as a Friend to His intimate friend!* and what confidence has not this bride to open her whole heart unreservedly to Him! In the third place, if He gives her all his treasures, His light, His graces, this bride also gives Him all that she hath; and the more she gives, the more she receives. In the fourth place, a close union of feelings is formed be-

tween GOD and this beloved soul; *it no longer wills anything but what God wills and as He wills; and God humbles Himself also to will only what it wills: so that from these two wills there results but one.* Finally, *they mutually support each other's interests;* the bride remembers that her Bridegroom exposed Himself to death for her; and there is nothing which she will not sacrifice for His Love. —pp. 282, 283.

The very term "*Familiar Love*" is enough. One more extract must suffice:—

INEBRIATED LOVE.

As excess of wine causes a shameful inebriation which gives death to the soul, so *the pious excess* of Divine Love causes to the soul *a wise inebriation* which gives it life. The one is an inebriation of intemperance; the other an inebriation of soberness, grace, and love. The one weakens and disfigures the body; the other sustains, purifies, and consecrates it. So was it with the Apostles on the day of Pentecost: they were all filled with fire kindled in their hearts by the Holy Ghost, Who is a Spirit of Love; *this fire burnt in their eyes, their gestures, their words, and their whole persons. It is not surprising that the gross people supposed them drunken with new wine.* (Acts, ii.) It is, indeed, says St. Bernard, the new wine of Divine Love which causes to the soul a holy inebriation and a most wise folly: mustum divini amoris in sapientem compellit insaniam (De dign. div. Amor.); this happens when burning more than ordinarily in prayer, it is now surprised and carried away by fresh and delightful discoveries; now dazzled by a brilliant and insupportable light; now tastes an exquisite sweetness which delights it, carries it away, and transports it out of itself; now is, as it were, overwhelmed by an excessive abundance of affections, joys, and caresses. Those torrents of Divine Consolations inundate, absorb, and *deprive it of sense; it knows no more what it*

says or does: in a word, it is *inebriated with the delicious excess* of what it sees and of what it feels.

The King, says the bride, brought me into his wine-cellar: introduxit me rex in cellam vinariam. (Cant. ii.) There He so inebriated her with His Love, that she swooned and required support. Inebriated with this mystic wine of the Spouse, she says these admirable words: Eat, O friends; drink, yea, be inebriated; O beloved: comedite, amici, et bibite, et inebriamini, charissimi. (Cant. v.) A soul inebriated with the Love of God, far from losing true reason, is filled with ardent zeal for the Glory of God, and for the salvation of man: it would have its Beloved the Beloved of all the world, and would have all its friends inebriated with His Love.

AFFECTIONS.—FIRST DAY.

Introduxit me rex in cellam vinariam. (Cant. ii.)

The King, says the bride, brought me into his wine-cellar. Is not this mystic cellar, into which Thou broughtest Thy beloved, Thine own Heart? for she loved Thee with all the tenderness of hers, and Thou bringest there all who love Thee like her. Is not this delicious wine, with which Thou hast inebriated her, that of *violent love, which deprives her of all human feelings*, to be conscious only of Thy Divine operations; which causes in the mind *a happy alienation of natural reason*, that it may reason henceforth only on the supernatural principles with which Thou inspirest it, and which carnal men regard as true intoxication; which extinguishes in the heart all fires kindled by self-love, to inflame it with that of Thy Charity; which makes it perform for thy Glory *bold and extraordinary actions*, which the guilty world considers as extravagant? *Bring me, Lord, into this Divine Cellar, inebriate me with the precious wine of Thy Love:* I shall never have more temperance and more wisdom than when I shall have entirely surrendered myself to *the holy inebriation and the wise folly* of Thy Love.—pp. 318, 320.

Could any *sane* person commit such writing as this to print, without reflecting on the infinite impieties and blasphemies and insults, to which he was exposing the most awful truths by putting such a volume into the hands of the public?

I should feel thankful indeed to be convinced that Dr. Pusey is ignorant of the use which such books as he is now publishing may be applied to. But whether he knows it or not, it is absolutely certain that it is the class of devotional writings he is now recommending and endeavouring to circulate among the members of our church—young and excitable females, and others,—by means of which the Jesuits have been able to wield and turn the minds of their disciples to the most infamous purposes. For if they had not such minds to work on, imaginative,—sentimental,—predisposed to a poetical and dreamy fanaticism,—easily inflamed by the raptures of an enthusiastic and extravagant pietism,—unless, I say, they knew how to use such minds as these, and had tools at hand to shape and fashion them to the iniquitous ends of their unchristian selfishness, their works of darkness must stand still for want of those unsuspected agents by which they are mainly carried on. The books Dr. Pusey is translating, and recommending, and forcing into circulation, are just the tools which Jesuits work with, and by which Jesuits are made. Is he ignorant of this?

CHAPTER IX.

FANATICISM—DR. PUSEY'S MEDITATION ON INEBRIATED LOVE.

THE last of the passages quoted in the preceding chapter was broken off before its termination. It is, however, so exceedingly characteristic of the sort of fanaticism which this school is substituting for Church-of-England, or, to speak more truly, for Christian piety, that it would be wrong to omit the remainder. I hope my reader will recollect that it was taken from Avrillon's "Year of Affections," which Dr. Pusey has translated and adapted to the use of the English church. The passage, of which I have already transcribed the commencement, proceeds as follows:—

SECOND DAY.

Introduxit me rex, &c.

Follow Thy Spouse, O my soul; He will bring thee into His Divine Cellars, to inebriate thee there with His Love. Thou wilt find there exquisite wines of all sorts; and all these different wines increase, sustain, and perfect, love. Choose; it is in thy power: the Spouse will give thee what thou demandest. Wilt thou have the *strong wine* of constant and noble love? thou wilt find it in this abundant Cellar; thy Spouse Himself first drank of it plenteously when He suffered Death for thee; drink, and thou wilt find the flavour of constancy and strength. Dost thou desire fervent and zealous love? thou wilt find *this fiery liquor* in the Cellar of thy Spouse. This Cellar is His Heart, and this Heart is burning with zeal for thy salvation. Dost thou thirst for the wine of *tender love*,

full of sweetness, to console thee in dryness and in bitterness? thou wilt find it in abundance, thou shalt be His delights, He shall be thine, and He will *inebriate thee with chaste pleasures.*

THIRD DAY.

Introduxit me rex, &c.

If thou art so happy as to be brought into the Cellars of the Spouse, O my soul, make good use of this great favour, and come not forth till thou art inebriated with the delicious wine of His Holy Love. Drink deep draughts of this Heavenly liquor, which will fill thee with ineffable sweetness. Be not afraid to be thus inebriated, it is permitted thee, and will do thee no dishonour; be drowned and swallowed up in this Ocean of innocent delights: it is *not only a Cellar*, it is a vast unfathomable Sea. If thou lovest pleasures, thy Spouse presents thee with the most delightful. *Abandon thyself entirely to this holy inebriation.* Far from destroying the body, it sustains it; far from blinding the mind, it enlightens it; far from causing the loss of reason, it perfects it; far from carrying corruption into the heart, it purifies and consecrates it.

FOURTH DAY.

Introduxit me rex, &c.

Thou dost not invite me into Thy Cellars till *Thou hast entered them Thyself;* before *pressing me to inebriate myself* with Thy love, that which Thou bearest me caused Thee *to go out of Thyself in a Divine and Holy way*, which is all my glory and all my happiness. It made Thee descend from Heaven to earth to save my soul, and make it Thy bride, notwithstanding Thy Greatness and my low estate; it deprived Thee for thirty-three years of the splendour of thy Divinity, and clothed Thee with my flesh; it caused Thee to faint while suffering horrible torments for my love; it made Thee die, GOD though Thou art, to give me life; it made Thee *espouse the holy foolishness* of the Cross (1 Cor. i. 23) to redeem me from death;

it made Thee shed all Thy Blood, to inebriate me with that Sacred Liquor which love drew from Thy Veins; it *brought Thee down* to me in the Holy Communion, to serve me as food and drink. To what, LORD, can I attribute these extraordinary steps, but that *Thy Divine Love overcame Thee?* Shall I refuse to do for Thee what Thou hast done for me?

FIFTH DAY.

Comedite, amici, et bibite, et inebriamini, charissimi. (Cant. v.)

Eat, O friends, and drink, said the bride, and be drunken, O beloved. To eat, to drink, to be drunken; what gross expressions for a man of the world, who has only the polish of the world! But, O my GOD, what sublime language for a soul that Thou hast carefully instructed in the Divine operations of Thy love! The carnal man prepares a table of intemperance, the bride one of soberness: he gives material wine in excess, which causes the loss of reason; she offers in Thy Name the spiritual wine of Thy love, which procures true Wisdom: he often falls shamefully; she is *supported by her own inebriation*, because strength is the inseparable character of the Love which inebriates her: he loses his memory, forgets Thee, and forgets himself; she forgets herself, only because she is entirely occupied with Thee. Receive me, LORD, to that Divine repast where Thou makest Thy nearest friends *so blessedly inebriated* with the excess of Thy love, until I shall possess that kingdom which Thou hast promised me, where I shall be filled and overwhelmed with *the delights of Thy Table* throughout Eternity.

SIXTH DAY.

Inebriamini, charissimi.

How is it possible, LORD, to be *overfilled* with the delicious wine of Thy love, when *Thy most perfect lovers are always insatiable*, and the more they drink of this Heavenly Liquor, the more they thirst for it? The most exquisite

wines at first flatter the senses, while their excess disgusts; but that of Thy love ever excites the thirst of the soul. It is true that a single drop of this sacred wine always procures true pleasures; but I feel also assuredly, that abundance would infinitely increase my thirst and my desire. If this delicious wine of Thy Love entered my heart like an impetuous torrent, it would still desire Thee; if this insatiable heart were plunged, drowned, swallowed up in it as in a vast sea, its thirst would yet be more ardent. But *I understand, Heavenly Spouse*, that in Thy Love *thirst exists with inebriation*, and that Thou art never more ardently desired than when thou art possessed, and when we are entirely filled with the precious wine of sublime charity.

SEVENTH DAY.

Inebriamini, charissimi.

To lose the mind, the memory, and the senses, to say and do extravagant things, are the monstrous consequences of the inebriation of wine; but *they are also the effects of the inebriation of Divine Love;* and when we go forth from the Holy Table of the Spouse, *if it is not so with us, we have failed in our duty*, because we have not loved sufficiently. Yes, LORD, I desire to love Thee *even to the loss of my mind*, I mean this human mind, this worldly mind, which is not in accordance with Thine, that I may think and reason only according to the rules of Thy love; I desire *to lose the memory of all sensible things*, that I may remember only Thy Goodness and Thy Mercies; I desire to lose, *by my inebriation*, all sense of pleasure, insults, and amusements, that I may feel henceforth only the ardours of Thy Charity; I desire to speak only the language of Divine Love, and I *consent to stammer in all beside;* I desire also to undertake, with holy boldness, all that Thy Love shall command me, even if I pass for a madman in the eyes of men: happy and wise madness, for it will proceed only from the inebriation of Thy Love, which is sovereign Wisdom!—pp. 318—323.

I suppose, in most persons, who have a repugnance to the mixture of gross language and images with acts of devotion, and whose religious feelings are anything better than romance and poetry, the first impression on reading such writing as this, will be simple horror and disgust at its coarse irreverence. And when they have recovered the stunning effects of the first perusal, the question will force itself on their minds, What good can any one expect to do by such writing?—How many persons in the whole circle of any one's acquaintance are there, into whose hands one would desire to put such a book! How many are there, to whom it could be given with safety?—without a certainty of its doing positive injury, whether by filling the minds of enthusiastic young persons with the notion of their being capable of sustaining such transcendental devotions, or else by tempting them to adopt language and work themselves into feelings, utterly beyond their real experience, and therefore false and delusive? In how many cases, also, will not this sort of writing fill the mind with really gross and improper thoughts and recollections? In how many more will it not inevitably lead to such blasphemies—such ridicule and scorn of sacred things—such hardening the heart against religion altogether, as something which its votaries acknowledge to be a species of mental inebriation and pious frenzy,—that it is impossible to think of the mischiefs such a book

will do, without a sickening of the heart. In truth (and this has repeatedly struck me while examining these productions) it is scarcely charitable to suppose, that those who prepare such books for the public can be in their right senses. But, without stopping to consider either the effects of such a volume, or the sanity of the persons concerned in its publication, much less the use which the book is capable of being put to, (and very possibly may,) in furthering the schemes of the Jesuits, there is a question which, if I mistake not, is of far more importance—namely, whether the representations here given of the spiritual state of the Christian be true or scriptural. I believe them to be both unscriptural and false; and I should be glad to know if Dr. Pusey, or any of his friends, will venture to defend them on this ground. I believe it to be false to say, that the effects of the sanctifying indwelling of the Holy Spirit in the Christian soul (and if this be not what Dr. Pusey means by the inebriation of Divine Love, I should wish to know what he does mean,) are "to loose the mind, the memory, and the senses —to say and do extravagant things,"—to be deprived "of all human feelings," or to suffer a "happy alienation of natural feelings." I believe such a statement to be both false and unscriptural. And further, I believe, that to persuade people, that, when they go forth from the Holy Table of the Spouse, *if it is not so with them*, they have failed in

their duty, because they have not loved sufficiently, —is to turn the Lord's Table into an instrument of fanatical excitement and enthusiasm, and is such a representation as is not only calculated to drive the humble Christian to despair, and to send away the excitable sentimentalist puffed up with self-satisfied conceits and raptures,—but is false and unscriptural also. Consequently, it is not merely the disgust caused by the revolting image of piety tricked out in the most loathsome accompaniments of debauchery, loss of mind, memory, and senses, extravagant words and gestures, stammering, and fiery eyes, and insatiable thirst—it is not merely the horror which one must feel, at seeing the most sacred and reverential act of communion with our Redeemer profaned by an unnatural association with the excesses of a depraved sensuality —nor is it the effects which such a book must have, in making some men fanatics, and others scoffers and blasphemers—it is not any, nor all of these, I confess, which forms, in my view, the *real* evil of this book and its companions. The real evil I believe to be this—that these writers are putting forth notions of Christian piety which are untrue, and contrary to Scripture; and, however lightly this school seems to think of the value and sacredness of truth, nothing can be more certain to me than that false and unscriptural notions of piety have for their source and author the father of lies

and the deceiver of mankind, and that what begins in disregard of truth, is likely to end in profaneness and immorality—at best, in a drivelling fanaticism and superstition.

As to the manner in which Dr. Pusey speaks of the Almighty as entering into his cellars himself, and being *overcome* by His love; the ideas such language expresses and suggests are so shocking, that it is more fitted for the enthusiasms of a heathen, than the prayers of a Christian. But I must entreat my reader to observe, how slight a regard for truth this imagery discovers. In one part of the Meditation, the Lord is described as entering into his cellars, and *going out of himself* in a divine and holy way; in another, *the cellar* is explained to signify *the Heart* of Christ, as if the two ideas of its being *his heart*, and *his going out of himself to enter into it*, were not totally incongruous. I am perfectly aware, that some persons regard these poetical fictions in prayer as harmless, if not actually edifying. Others, however, and the greater number, I hope and believe, view the matter in rather a more serious light.

CHAPTER X.

MORE SPECIMENS OF FANATICISM—ST. GILBERT'S NUNS.

THE passages I have transcribed from Dr. Pusey are not the only instances I have noticed of the tendency of this school to give encouragement to fanaticism. A very extraordinary example of this kind is found in the life of St. Gilbert, and is particularly curious from its connexion with the effort Mr. Newman's party are making to propagate a taste for the monastic life. The passage is as follows, and I shall beg my reader to observe, in passing, the manner in which the temptations of Christ are spoken of:—

Females require direction in a different way from men. It is the unruly intellect of man which leads him into error, while a woman errs from disorganized affections and untamed feelings; and, what is most pitiable to think upon, often those who aim highest, have the most terrible and signal fall. She who moves along the beaten path of life without being either very good or very bad, is in little danger of fanaticism; while she who is placed *above ordinary ties and affections*, and strives to fix her desires on God alone, finds at once a class of temptations of which others have no conception. *The devil placed before our Lord temptations so subtle, that we can hardly tell the meaning of them, or discover how it would have been sin to yield to them.* Again, in the unfathomable mystery of those words, My God, My God, why hast Thou forsaken me? spoken upon the cross by Him who was Very God, it is possible to gather that the soul, most closely united to God, may be deprived of the consciousness of His presence in

an incomprehensible way. All these are temptations, pressing upon *the highest souls*, of a kind quite different from those which beset the path of *common-place christians*. And to withstand these, it requires *an implicit faith, and an utter resignation of the will*, which very few possess. Hence, the wild and terrible forms of fanaticism which have appeared from time to time in persons, who, with proper guidance, might have been Sisters of Charity or contemplative nuns. On the other hand, by *the sweet and gentle ways of holy obedience*, a character is formed of a nature distinct from any other, and which no austerities can alone bestow. Of course, God in His mercy can guide peaceful and holy souls through any difficulties even without these aids, but it is dangerous to be without them, for who can stand in the hour of trial when it comes across the soul that after all she may be contemplating herself instead of God, and all her feelings may be illusion? A gentle voice is needed to bid the soul wait in darkness till God give her light, as He assuredly will do, sooner or later.

Any one who knows by what processes the Jesuits succeed in persuading their disciples to give up the use of reason and the exercise of will, and submit to be moved and governed, as if they were living corpses, destitute of volition and responsibility, will understand what is meant by these commendations of implicit faith, and utter resignation of the will, and the sweet and gentle ways of holy obedience, and will not need me to tell him, what is the real drift and aim of such exhortations. When young people have been brought to believe that their duty is to forsake their duties, and to transfer the obedience which God and nature require them

to pay to their parents, to their self-constituted spiritual superiors, the most unprincipled persons are not so well adapted as these silly enthusiasts, for working out the schemes of crafty and designing men. And one method by which they are cajoled and bribed into this state of abject slavery of mind and body, is the encouragement given to expect such raptures and visions as this author proceeds to dilate upon.

On the other hand, corresponding to these trials, there are joys in contemplation which *ordinary souls* cannot know. They are described by those who have felt them with a substantive clearness, which shows even to those who have never felt them, that there is a deep philosophy in the cross which simple and crucified souls can know, but which is beyond the reach of the mere student, however learned he may be. We are so tied down to things of sense, that we can only aim at immaterial and invisible things through sensible objects; spiritual things can only be discerned by spirit, and therefore can but be understood by us indirectly, till our bodies, after the blessed resurrection, become spiritual. But it is possible to conceive that there is a way of seeing the invisible, analogous to, and yet totally distinct in kind from, the perceptions of sense; and for a short time, and in a small degree, God has vouchsafed such an opening of the invisible world to His saints on earth. Few, indeed, there are to whom such a grace is given, but there are many states short of this to which *more ordinary souls* may attain, remembering, all the while, that of the highest, as well as the lowest, charity is the essence, and that which alone gives them value. *Obedience to authority*, [I hope my readers will notice this language, and that by this time they understand what it means,] which comes to us in the place of God, and

humility, are the steps by which the Holy Spirit thus exalts souls dead to the world and to themselves. It was to produce in the soul these virtues that the Gilbertine canons were instituted, and what were the general results of the system may be gathered from one case which is confessedly an extraordinary one. "In one of the monasteries, says St. Aeldred, which under the venerable father Gilbert, are daily sending up to heaven plentiful fruits of chastity, there was once, and perhaps may be still, a holy virgin, and she had so expelled from her breast all love of the world and carnal affections, all care for bodily wants and outward anxiety, that with a burning soul she loathed earthly things, and longed after heavenly. And sometimes it happened, that when her mind was occupied in her wonted prayer, a mysterious and wondrous sweetness would come over her and put an end to all the movements of the soul, to all quick-coming thoughts, nay, even all those spiritual thoughts which concerned her friends. Then her soul, in a manner bidding adieu to all worldly burdens, would be rapt above itself; it would be caught up by a strange ineffable and incomprehensible light, so that it saw nothing else but That which is, and which is the being of all. Nor was this a bodily light or any likeness of a bodily thing; it was not extended nor shed abroad, so that it could be seen everywhere; without being contained itself, it contained all things, and that in a wonderful and ineffable manner, just as Being contains all that is, and truth whatever is true. When, therefore, this light was shed around her, then she began to know Christ no longer after the flesh, for the breath of her nostrils, Christ Jesus had led her into the truth itself. After lying a considerable time in this trance, the sisters could only with difficulty bring her back to her bodily senses by shaking her. This happened several times, and they entreated her to explain what took place in these trances. *Then began the others to long to attain to the height of this vision;*

wherefore, they strove to withdraw their minds from all worldly cares and anxieties; and by tears and continued prayers many obtained the same grace, so that among the sisters, many were, *even against their will*, plunged into this light. There was there in the convent a nun of *consummate good sense*, and she, knowing that it is not right to trust to every spirit, thought that this state was to be attributed to disease or fantastic illusions, and as much as she could, tried to dissuade the sisters from having these visions frequently. One day she asked the Superioress why no such thing happened to herself, and she received for answer, Because thou dost not believe us, nor love in others that virtue which thou hast not thyself. Then the nun answered, Do thou pray to God for me, that if this be from Him, the same thing may happen to me. And when they had prayed for some days to no purpose, she asked the same question of the Superioress, who answered, Thou must renounce all the things of this world, and *affections for every mortal*, and employ thyself in thinking about God alone. What, said she, *am I not to pray for my friends and benefactors?* Then, answered the Superioress, when thou wouldst ascend by contemplation to the higher powers of thy soul, thou must commend and entrust to God all whom thou lovest; and as though thou wert quitting this world, bidding adieu to every creature, raise up thy soul to the sight of Him whom thou lovest. She, however, still believed not, but begged of her to pray yet more, that if these things came from God, she should receive what she desired. Still she said, I would not have my soul so rapt from the body, and raised on high, that the remembrance of all things, and *above all, of my friends*, should be wiped away from my mind; I shall be satisfied to know whether these things be of God. Now, on the day of Pentecost, when she was tossing about with anxious thoughts, the light of which we have spoken was shed upon her, so that she was wafted up into it in an unspeakable

manner, and was raised on high. Then unable to bear with her weak vision that inaccessible light which was beaming upon her, she prayed that her soul should be recalled, as far as it might, to the contemplation of the passion of the Lord. Then, though she had before seen in a rapid glance that which is very being, she was suffered to descend from this lofty vision to a lower one, and was transferred in spirit to that vision of the Passion, and saw in the spirit Jesus hanging on the cross, pierced with the nails, smitten through with the lance, and the blood flowing through the five wounds, and Him looking on herself with a most tender look. Then bursting into tears, and repenting, she begged pardon of her sisters, and declared herself unworthy of this light." *There are more things in heaven and earth than are dreamt of in our philosophy, and we might have learned this from him* who was carried up into the third heaven, whether in the body or out of the body he knew not, and heard things which human words could no more express than the eye can hear, or the ear see.

And who were these in whom God showed forth these wonders? They were not persons sitting with their hands across all day following the fancy or the feeling of the moment: their vestments were not long and flowing, nor their veils elegantly disposed about their foreheads; their churches were not magnificent, nor did beautiful strains of devotional music float from the pealing organ through their long-drawn cloisters. They were simply little, quiet-looking nuns of St. Benedict; the wimple which enveloped their head and throat was plain and coarse, and so was their veil; and even the ample cuculla or long white mantle which they wore in choir was not to sweep along the ground, "for they who delight in this or in beauty of apparel without doubt are rejected of God." For the winter they had a tippet of rough sheep-skin, and a cap lined with white lamb's wool, for it was very cold when

they rose in the night and went into the church, when the wind blew across the fens of Lincolnshire, or the chill mist rose from the waters of the river which surrounded their little islands.—St. Gilbert, pp. 84—90.

Truly the young people of the present day must be very differently constituted to those that went before them, if some very strange results do not follow from such notions as these being put into their heads. There is no great difficulty in persuading a silly young female, that if she forsakes her duties and fancies herself "placed above ordinary ties and affections," her foolish whims and fancies are temptations which "*common-place* Christians" have no conception of, and her joys such as "*ordinary souls* cannot know." If "*ordinary souls*" and "*common-place* Christians" should question the reality of these temptations, and doubt, whether there be any evil in that to which these victims of delusion imagine themselves tempted, the answer is ready—that the temptations of Christ himself were "so subtle, that we can hardly tell the meaning of them, or discover how it would have been sin to yield to them;"—though to "ordinary minds" and "*common-place* Christians," such an answer would rather increase the difficulty than otherwise,—as one of the temptations of Christ was, to cast himself from the pinnacle of the temple, and another, to fall down and worship the devil—of neither of which is it very obvious, what this author

can mean, when he says, that they are "so subtle, that we can hardly tell the meaning of them, or discover how it would have been sin to yield to them;" —in both cases, I should have thought the meaning and the sin being intelligible enough.

But it is easy to see how young people, puffed up with conceit and the spiritual pride of a false humility, can be taught in this way to regard as extraordinary temptations and conflicts with Satan, the diseased vagaries to which they have subjected their imaginations by accustoming themselves to sneer at "*ordinary souls*" and "*common-place*" Christians, by abandoning their duties to their families, by disfiguring themselves with wimples and cucullas, by working up their minds to impassioned flights of devotion, by punishing their bodies with voluntary torments to expiate their offences, and (as Dr. Pusey recommends after Bonaventure) by disciplining themselves to blood, under the monstrous delusion that, by such self-inflicted lacerations, they can "experience" the sufferings of Christ, and *know* in themselves, "what he suffered at the pillar." To such persons, likewise, the transition is easy enough from temptations to ecstasies and revelations:— though a sober Christian might have supposed that to require people to renounce their affections for every mortal, so as not even to pray for their friends and benefactors, and to wipe away from their minds the remembrance of those they ought to love, would carry

rather the appearance of a temptation of Satan, than of a preparation for the enjoyment of the beatific vision. However, be this as it may, I think it is of some importance that people should be fully aware, what is the character and nature of the devotional spirit which this school professes to cultivate. And this fanaticism is not confined to devotional exercises, but is shown in the claims they are laying to supernatural light and inspiration. Most extraordinary passages of this description are found in Dr. Pusey's books. For example, in his *adaptation* of Surin to the use of the English church, where he talks of truths which God inspires him to propound,* and says, "As for me, I only follow His direction, and am hardly master of my pen,"†—and in another place he says, "We feel ourselves, in fact, more enlightened in this one instant, than we should be after ten years of study in the schools. This is done by the operation of the Holy Spirit, and by the infusion of a light which is quite simple, with no variety of objects, but which contains within itself the essence and abridgment of a thousand truths;"‡ and to illustrate the superiority of this inward light to that of reason or study, he says—

This has been proved in very many instances, and particularly with respect to St. Theresa. Fifteen learned men were assembled at Avila to judge by what spirit she was led. When the examination was finished, they concluded that

* Page 234. † Page 245. ‡ Page 189.

the astonishing things that God worked in her were the operations of the devil. But a holy monk, of the Order of St. Francis, passing by, perceived and declared, that it was the Spirit of God that governed her; and St. Francis of Borgia, more illustrious for the gift of contemplation which God had given him than for his learning, confirmed this declaration.

It is written in the life of St. Clara of Monte-Falco, that she discovered a concealed heretic, who was universally regarded and revered as a Saint. God has worked many other wonders in His servants. He sent St. Bernard to destroy many errors, and to undeceive many heretics. Yet the Saint in his youth had given but little time to study, and with all his talent, what he had learned could not have sufficed to write the many admirable works which he has left us.

Even women, as St. Catherine of Sienna, St. Theresa, and some others, have discoursed so well on the Mysteries of the Faith, that their works cannot be read without admiration. St. Ignatius, the Founder of the Company of Jesus, had received such light on the Ineffable Mystery of the Trinity, that he undertook to write a book on it without having studied. St. Francis of Assisi, when consulted on many difficult passages of Scripture, instantly replied so clearly, that learned men were surprised at him. You have only to read the Chronicles of his Order to see some remarkable instances of this; and all this proceeds, not from the strength and penetration of the human mind, but from Divine Illumination. Therefore it is more fitly called wisdom than learning.—pp. 190, 191.

It is impossible to imagine any extravagance of fanaticism to which such teaching will not lead;—or, let me add,—any crime, which a person inflated with such notions cannot by skilful management be induced to commit, and imagine all the while he is

doing God service. And how impervious to all argument from reason or Scripture must be a mind imbued with this theory of Dr. Pusey's. Indeed, between explanations, developments, and meditations, the letter of Scripture can have but little influence in such minds—after a while, probably, but little reverence. Alban Butler, in his life of St. Teresa, (who seems an especial favourite with Dr. Pusey,) tells a story which may not be inappropriate in this connexion:—

> At Toledo, a young woman who had gained a reputation of virtue, petitioned to be admitted to the habit, but added, "I will bring with me my Bible." "What!" said the Saint, "your Bible?" Do not come to us. We are poor women who know nothing but how to spin, and to do what we are bid."

From which it may be gathered, that one of the fruits of this inward light is *not* any particular affection for the Holy Scriptures, but rather a dislike of them—which is, perhaps, a consequence more sad than surprising.

And that, in fact, this doctrine does go to degrade the authority of the Holy Scriptures by its monstrous elevation of the light it attributes to the Saints, is plain from another passage of Dr. Pusey's adaptation of Surin:—

> The Saints, through faith, perceive things in a way to which human reason cannot attain. What they say is true in a sense which the Holy Spirit teaches them, and which they alone comprehend. It is enough to know that *St.*

Paul and St. Francis were enlightened from above, and that they said nothing of which they were not fully convinced, nothing which they were not able to assert without exaggeration or deception. *If others do not understand it, how can they dare condemn it?*—pp. 29, 30.

A doctrine which, in theory, must put the commentaries of the so-called Saint, and the letter of the Word of God, on a footing of perfect equality;—but, in practice, puts them far above it, and fixes any meaning upon the letter of Holy Scripture which St. Francis, or St. Teresa, or St. Ignatius Loyola may choose to put upon it.

CHAPTER XI.

DR. PUSEY'S JESUITICAL DOCTRINE OF HUMILITY.

I HAVE already remarked, that the disregard of truth, so remarkable in this movement and its details, is nowhere more conspicuous than in the doctrine of humility which these writers inculcate. As Surin happens to lie open, I may as well quote a passage or two from it, illustrative of this remark, which will also serve to show the false and delusive system of Jesuitical morals Dr. Pusey is now labouring to propagate:—

Lastly, the third sort of persons who do not dream of excuses and apologies, are those who, being unjustly accused and blackened to the world, say nothing in their own defence. Of this number were Saint Theodora, Saint Peter Martyr, and some others, *who chose* rather to live long in disgrace, and to endure rigorous penances, *than to clear themselves of the enormous crimes with which they were charged.* They rejoiced to be treated as great criminals, and suffered this humiliation in silence for the love of our Lord, Who at last took their cause in hand, and made their innocence known. The truth being then acknowledged, their past shame served greatly to increase the renown of their sanctity.

Our author, by the words which I have quoted, encourages those who find themselves in any similar circumstances, to profit by them, gladly to receive *this portion of Christ's Cup* as the most precious treasure in the world. The way to do this is to consider contempt and dishonour as a very great advantage. And hereby the maxims of

those worldly philosophers of whom I have spoken, are manifestly condemned. For they maintain that we are not permitted to neglect our reputation, and that we must defend our honour at the expense of worldly goods and life, if only it can be done without offending God. *What offence would Saint Peter Martyr have committed, if, when he was accused of having introduced females into his cell, he had confessed that they were sainted women, who came from Heaven to visit him?* Does it not appear that God would have been thereby more honoured, *since he would have prevented the scandal caused among his brethren by his silence?* Yet he did not defend himself; he resolutely concealed the truth, being *desirous to imitate our Lord*, Who, during His whole Passion, spoke no word to justify Himself from the great crimes of which He was accused. We find that *God approved of his conduct*, and bounteously recompensed his rare and heroic humility. But *these great examples are far beyond the reach of our human wisdom*, which teaches us only to love honour, to avoid contempt, and to seek our own interest in all things, instead of following Christ, Who saved us by the foolishness of the Cross.—pp. 31, 32.

I suppose few well instructed persons would consider themselves justified in imitating the conduct which Dr. Pusey here recommends as nothing less than sanctity. A Christian should indeed be dead to the slanders of those who hate him for his Master's sake; and he should bear patiently those misunderstandings of his brethren, which he fails to remove by a simple statement of truth and a denial of misrepresentation. But that, under the deeply erroneous notion of taking a "portion of Christ's cup," and imitating his passion,—he should allow his brethren to be scanda-

lized, and perhaps turned away from the truth, rather than contradict a falsehood, and should suffer his Master's name and religion to be blasphemed, rather than deny that he was guilty of a gross and enormous crime, is such a notion of humility as never could enter into the mind of any one, who had a just value for truth, or a clear perception of its nature.

In the same spirit is the following specimen of Jesuitism, which occurs in a subsequent part of the same volume:—

Thus, to disguise ourselves for the love of Christ, and to deceive the eyes of the world, is something heroic, and a sign of great perfection; it is a secret of the Gospel which has been revealed to Saints only, that is, to those who burning with the desire of resembling the Saviour, of being despised, rejected, calumniated, and condemned, as He was, perfectly imitated the first Christians, whom St. Paul represents as *being destitute, afflicted, tormented; of whom the world was not worthy.* Heb. xi. 37, 38. They not only practised this themselves, but also recommended it to all the faithful as the most heroic thing in the world. But no one has done so in stronger terms, and more expressly, than St. Ignatius,* who will have his children desire nothing so much as to wear the livery of their Divine Master; that is, to suffer, after His Example, outrages, false witnesses, and injuries. He will have them desirous even to be accounted fools, yet never giving occasion for it, and by this shame to obtain great merit with God.—p. 176.

When people are taught that deception of any

* It may be as well to repeat what I have already observed, that here and elsewhere Dr. Pusey means by St. Ignatius, Ignatius Loyola, the founder of the Jesuits, or the Company of Jesus, as Dr. Pusey calls them.

sort is "something heroic, and a sign of great perfection," it is to be feared that their sanctity may take dangerous and disreputable modes of developing itself.

Of course, Dr. Pusey does not mean that those to whom he recommends these practices of deception, should deceive *their confessors*, or conceal the truth from *them*. And can he be ignorant, that what the Jesuit Surin really means to recommend, is that sort of abnegation of self by which the individual Jesuit is taught to lose and sacrifice himself in and for the interests of his order, and cheat the whole world, whenever the aggrandizement of the order and the power of the Papal throne may be promoted by the fraud, "for the greater Glory of God," as they impiously express it. Should not Dr. Pusey know that this is the real drift of Surin's exhortations, and that it is by confusing men's notions of truth and falsehood in this way they are prepared to execute the worst purposes of the worst of men?

But even though there should be no intention to teach men to practise deception, the school of morals Dr. Pusey is now advocating encourages a habit of exaggeration in the expression of feelings of devotion and humility which is destructive of the love of truth.

St. Vincent Ferrier found in himself so little cause for vanity, that he looked on himself with horror, and was unendurable to himself. St. Ignatius *wished after his*

death to be refused Christian burial. St. Catherine of Genoa said, that *she would rather see a demon*, however hideous, than herself in the state she was in. The Saints, by thus despising and annihilating themselves, obtained the enjoyment of God, while those who do otherwise, separate themselves from Him by their vanity, according to these words which our Author makes Him speak: "The more thou canst go out of thyself, so much the more wilt thou be able to enter into Me. B. iii. c. 56. To go out of ourselves, is to think not at all of ourselves, nor to speak of ourselves, except when we are obliged to do so, or *when we are about to confess.*—pp. 105, 106.

But such extravagant and unnatural expressions of humility as these of St. Ignatius and St. Catherine, are anything but "to *think* not at all of ourselves,"—to say nothing of *speaking.* Are they not much more like the language of people who think and speak of scarcely anything else? And how any one —much less a Saint—who, however lowly in her own eyes, retained any love for God, could really prefer the sight of an evil spirit to herself, seems impossible. In truth, the remark is too obvious to be worth making: it is, however, very well worth noticing, what sort of notions of humility and piety and morals Dr. Pusey and his friends are gathering from the writings of the Jesuits, as a substitute for the humility and piety of the church of England. Another extract, and we may close Dr. Pusey's adaptation of Surin for the present.

St. Theresa declared she had no fear of death, because she knew that in dying she should fall into the hands of

Him Whom she loved the best. Another Saint, carrying in one hand a torch, and in the other a pitcher of water, said that *she desired with the one to burn Heaven, and with the other to extinguish the flames of hell, that she might think no more but of love, and that henceforth she might serve God for His goodness only.*—p. 113.

One really seems in a dream when reading such language as this. Does Dr. Pusey mean to teach people that it is a proper and Christian-like desire, to wish to be able to burn heaven, or even to extinguish hell? Is this piety? Is this that love of God which is inspired by the Holy Ghost, and taught us in the sacred Scriptures? If not, it is simply a falsehood:—and if any one can be induced by the reading of these pernicious books, to set about bringing himself into such an unnatural and unchristian state of mind, it can only be at the risk of losing his salvation. Jesus Christ teaches his followers, to govern their affections and their conduct by the fear of hell, and by the hope of heaven. Is this true, or is it not? Is it true, or is it not, that the Word of God teaches men to act on these motives? Does the Bible teach mankind to live above them? Does it teach them to regard them as low and unworthy motives—fit, only, for "ordinary souls," and "common-place Christians," and people of "common sense"—and to aspire to an heroicity of sanctity, which shall love God, without any consideration or regard for one's own eternal happiness or misery? That it is

the duty of a creature—to say nothing of a Christian—to love God so much, and to acquiesce so entirely in His will, as to be willing to commit his eternal destiny, without reserve, to His disposal,—and that such piety is possible,—who can doubt?—however few there be that really attain to it, so as to possess it as anything more than a passing feeling in a moment of devotional excitement or contrition. But this is not the feeling which Dr. Pusey is recommending, nor anything resembling it; but such a love for God, as shall make the soul deliberately desire to have the motives which God himself has enjoined us to act on, annihilated, in order to render possible a sort of piety which has no real existence, and which, if it had, would render it impossible to obey that law which God has implanted in our nature, and which His Word makes the foundation of our duty to Him, and to our neighbour, when it requires us to govern our conduct towards Him by hope and fear, and to love our neighbour *as ourselves*. After all, the just impressions such monstrous exaggerations should make, may be left to themselves to produce, at least in all reasonable minds. A charitable person will hope that the unknown Saint, to whom the sentiment is ascribed, either had no real existence, or is very much misrepresented by Dr. Pusey and his author.

CHAPTER XII.

DR. PUSEY'S DOCTRINE CONCERNING THE VIRGIN MARY—HIS ADAPTATION OF AVRILLON'S GUIDE FOR PASSING ADVENT HOLILY.

I HAVE already referred to the language Dr. Pusey has used concerning the Virgin Mary, and the superstitious reverence for her, and the erroneous doctrines regarding her, which he is endeavouring to inculcate. It is time to turn to this part of the subject. The volume to which I now propose to refer, I have largely extracted from already. It is, A Guide for passing Advent holily—another work of Avrillon's, which Dr. Pusey has translated from the French, and adapted to the use of the English Church. This expression, "adapted," it is very important to notice; not only because it implies, that Dr. Pusey has published these works in such a state as he considers safe and edifying to the English reader, but because he has, in point of fact, made several alterations in these works for the purpose of rendering them so. They may fairly be considered, therefore, authentic specimens of the doctrinal views he now desires to advocate, as far as he thinks proper to disclose his purpose. It is plain, that Dr. Pusey had misgivings that, after all his adaptations, some of the passages in this volume, relating to the Virgin Mary, would still be rather stronger than the English Church is as yet prepared

to receive. Of course, as in every other party movement, there are abundance of young people of both sexes ready to take on trust anything that Mr. Newman or Dr. Pusey may say. But the great mass of the English church are not yet disposed to acquiesce in the Romish doctrine or practices on *this* point; and, therefore, Dr. Pusey has, in his preface, thought it necessary to say a word or two on the subject:—

It is probable that the actions and example of the Blessed Virgin, although exhibited very partially, will still have more place in this work, than they now have in the thoughts of most persons. For it is not perhaps too much to say that a large class of religionists have ceased to set themselves any Exemplar at all, their very ideal of Christian life being St. Paul's picture of the unregenerate. And even apart from this, it ought to be said plainly, that there is a diseased dread of any reverent mention of her who was taught by the Holy Ghost to say, "All generations shall call me blessed," which threatens very serious evil, and even heresy. For *the thought of her is inseparable from meditation on the true doctrine of the Incarnation*, that our Lord was "God, of the Substance of His Father, begotten before the world, and Man of the substance of His Mother, born in the world." To deny the word θεοτόκος is, of course, heresy; to shrink from it then, is to be ashamed of the truth of God; to shrink from dwelling on the doctrine conveyed in it, that He "abhorred not the Virgin's womb," is secretly to have entertained some heretical counterfeit." —pp. lvii. lviii.

There are several points worthy of notice which this extract would suggest. For instance, the word θεοτόκος. *It is, undoubtedly*, heresy to deny the

DOCTRINE which the primitive church intended to assert by that word; and to be ashamed of that DOCTRINE, *is* to be ashamed of the truth of God. But is the *word* used now in the sense it was then, or with the same intention, or anything resembling it? Is it not absolutely certain, that, in the language of Roman Catholics, the phrase, *Mother of God*, is not used to imply, or to defend any doctrine whatever, *relative to the person of Christ*—except it be, their infinitely false and pernicious heresy, (for no less it is, and no less the primitive church would have regarded it,) that the Lord is under the dominion of the Virgin Mary, and that she governs Him with the authority of a mother;—which, however it may be disclaimed on occasions, is, in fact, the belief of the great mass of Romanists, and is the main foundation of a very large part of their acts of worship. And well would it be, if those whom Rome calls saints, and whom Dr. Pusey now venerates as saints, had not encouraged this delusion in their unscriptural and erroneous writings. The word θεοτόκος is no longer popularly used. But the term, "Mother of God," *is;* and this is used in a false and mischievous sense; and Dr. Pusey well knows, that it is *to this false and mischievous sense of the term*—and *not to the catholic sense of the term of which it is taken to be a translation*—that any protestant objects,—any one at least who is acquainted with the doctrines of his own church. It is a most

unworthy artifice (to say nothing of its dishonesty) to endeavour to raise a cry of heresy against those, who have no idea of shrinking from the defence of any catholic doctrine even at the cost of their lives, —but who, in the fear of God and the love of human souls,—abstain from using a term, which no one now uses or understands in any other sense except a false and erroneous one.

But, according to Dr. Pusey's notion, (which he has borrowed from the Romanists,) "the thought of her is inseparable from meditation on the true doctrine of the Incarnation"—which, if *meditation* be understood in Mr. Oakeley and Dr. Pusey's sense of the term, may be true enough of this *thought*, and of many more. But, that it *is* possible to meditate on the *true* doctrine of the Incarnation, and to meditate truly, without any reference to the Virgin Mary, Dr. Pusey may satisfy himself by a perusal of the epistles of St. John; and he would do well to ask himself,—if the connexion he imagines be so intimate, or rather "inseparable," how comes it, that the gospel of St. John contains not only no additional particulars concerning the previous history of the Virgin, but not even any account of those particulars of the Annunciation and Nativity, for which Mr. Oakeley is obliged to draw upon his imagination? On Dr. Pusey's theory, one would have expected the Gospel of St. John to have given a narrative of the Virgin's life from her birth,

and to have supplied all the information of which the Divine wisdom has seen fit to keep the church in ignorance, relative to the passages of her intercourse with Christ, during his infancy, childhood, youth, and manhood. The greatest part of the period of His sojourning on earth He passed in her society, and subject to her. Will Dr. Pusey consider, how much of what was said and done during that period has been recorded by that Evangelist, who wrote expressly in defence of the "true doctrine of the Incarnation"? Dr. Pusey's theory is simply and wholly a fiction. It never would have been thought of by him or by any one else, except for the purpose of propping up error and superstition. A really humble Christian does in no one particular manifest his humility more, than by the shrinking reverence with which he abstains from allowing his imagination to intrude into those subjects, which the goodness and wisdom of our Creator has (if we believe in the inspiration of the New Testament) *purposely* concealed. But, to be sure, in Dr. Pusey's calendar, "St. Paul and St. Francis" are to be listened to with equal reverence.

And then, as to taking the blessed Virgin for an exemplar:—in all points where the Holy Scripture informs us of her following His example who is the great Exemplar of all—both hers and ours—every humble Christian is thankful to be enabled to follow her; and so her example has ever been regarded,

and her memory revered, by all true sons of the church of England, and so they were, before ever Dr. Pusey and his friends had thought of commencing the "blessed work" of Romanizing. But *true piety is founded on truth*, and can breathe no other element: and therefore, when Scripture refuses information, it forbears; and the exemplar which it follows, is that which the Virgin herself followed,—the exemplar proposed in Holy Scripture for the imitation and guidance of all, at all times, and under every circumstance,—the example of the Son of God. But what does Dr. Pusey mean by saying that "a large class of religionists *have ceased to set themselves any exemplar at all*, their very ideal of a Christian life being St. Paul's picture of the unregenerate"? Does Dr. Pusey mean to insinuate, that all those persons who consider the seventh chapter of the Romans to describe the state of the regenerate, have ceased to set Christ to themselves as their exemplar? Does he mean to say this? If not, what does he mean? Above all,—what can this insinuation mean, which can in any way whatever serve his purpose of palliating, or rather of recommending, the superstitious and erroneous doctrine concerning the Virgin Mary, taught in this book, which he has adapted to the use of the English church? The impression made by the whole of this extract is extremely painful. It is too much in the style of one who is conscious of the untenable-

ness of the cause he has undertaken to defend, and is endeavouring to conceal its weakness by raising prejudices against its opponents. If there be at present "a *diseased* dread of any reverent mention" of the Blessed Virgin among *true* churchmen, Dr. Pusey and his party must bear the blame of it; since they are the very persons who have given such innumerable and melancholy proofs of the necessity of guarding, with unceasing vigilance and jealousy, against any the slightest approach in the direction of Romish error.

Avrillon has a meditation on the conception of the Virgin Mary, which Dr. Pusey has retained with considerable alterations. As it now stands, therefore, it represents the doctrine Dr. Pusey is prepared to adopt as his own, and which he considers safe and edifying for English readers. Nothing can be more certain than this, that the Romish doctrine of the conception of the Virgin Mary, and her super-angelical purity, is neither scriptural nor primitive. It is a superstition designed not to exalt the human nature of Christ, but to exalt the Virgin herself and give colour to the idolatrous reverence with which she is regarded. The mode of argument adopted by its advocates clearly proves this. No attempt is made to prove it from Holy Scripture, but an argument is constructed in this manner;—that, in order for the Lord's human nature to be absolutely pure, the nature of his mother, from

whom he derived it, must have been so likewise. The argument sometimes proves too much—or rather it always does so;—and in the extracts from Dr. Pusey's book, which I shall lay before my reader, it borders on profaneness. It is perfectly plain, that if there be any weight whatever in this argument, something more must be proved than merely the purity of *the Virgin Mary*. For if it be true, that, because the flesh of *Christ* was absolutely pure, therefore *hers* must be so also—for, it is in this way Mr. Newman applies the rule, a clean thing cannot come from an unclean—then this immaculate purity and freedom from original sin, must extend not only to the Virgin herself, but to all her progenitors up to Adam—for, plainly, the immaculate perfection of *her* nature only removes this difficulty one stage backwards,—if such a difficulty have any real existence. It will be seen now to what extravagant lengths Dr. Pusey has carried this notion:

MEDITATION UPON THE PURITY CONFERRED UPON ST. MARY, FROM THE GOSPEL.

Of whom was born Jesus, who is called Christ.

FIRST PART.

All the festivals of St. Mary have reference to her Son, for Whom she herself was; and so in the two festivals, which seem to centre in herself, her Conception and her Nativity, the Gospel appointed is that portion which relates to the birth of her Son, to conceive and bear Whom was the end of her Conception and Birth. To-day, on the festival "of a child who will not be born for nine months,"

is rehearsed "her glorious destination, and her Divine maternity;" she is conceived to-day, and the Gospel relates, "That it is of her that was born JESUS, Who is called CHRIST."

Verily, *how much more than angelic purity* must have been conferred on that body from which will one day be taken That of JESUS, which signifies a Saviour. The flesh of Mary is to become That of JESUS, says St. Bernard, and *the blood which shall be taken from her will be That of* CHRIST. That Flesh will one day be torn, and *That Blood* shed upon the Cross, and will be the instrument and the price of the redemption of mankind. *What degree then of purity* must not have been bestowed *on that flesh and blood!*

This "JESUS is called CHRIST," that is, the most pure and the most glorious of all anointings, since it is the anointing of the Divinity: that flesh now formed, will be, after the ineffable operation of the HOLY GHOST, *the Flesh of* GOD; the Divinity will therein corporeally dwell; *she* will be the ark, and overlaid with gold within and without, which shall receive the whole treasure of sanctification. For "the Angel having said, 'Hail, full of grace,' added, 'the Lord is with thee,' no earthly husband, but the Lord Himself of holiness, the Father of purity, the Creator of incorruption, the Giver of freedom, the Bestower of salvation, the Dispenser of true peace, Who of the virgin earth formed man, and of his rib took Eve, this LORD is with thee, and, again, of thee. For from the pure and chaste and undefiled and holy Virgin Mary cometh forth JESUS CHRIST our Lord, perfect in his Godhead and in his Manhood, consubstantial with the Father, consubstantial with us also in all things except sin." *What purity then must not that flesh have!*—pp. 51, 52.

Now, to say nothing of the unscriptural doctrine of Mary possessing "more than angelic purity"—what is to be thought of this notion, that it was

necessary for the blood which Mary received in her conception to be perfectly pure, (and if so, it was equally necessary for it to be *infinitely* pure,) *because* it was by that blood the sins of the world were to be atoned for. Because Christ was to shed on the cross his blood for the redemption of mankind—and, (according to Dr. Pusey,) the blood he then shed was in fact to be the blood of Mary, because derived from her;—therefore, it seems, it was necessary that her blood should have a corresponding degree of purity bestowed on it in the moment of her conception, to render it capable of being shed for the sins of the world. It is really horrible to be obliged to expose such infinite impiety. Will Dr. Pusey say distinctly that it was the blood of Mary which was shed on the cross for our redemption? If not—what becomes of the meaning of this disgusting rhapsody? But this is not all:

SECOND PART.

Of whom was born JESUS, Who is called CHRIST. (Matt. i. 16.)

It appears as if this oracle of the Gospel gives me the right, nay, even invites me to *enter respectfully* into the eternal decree of the predestination of Mary, the Mother of GOD, since it developes it before us, with sufficient clearness, by telling us beforehand that it is of her that JESUS was born. Mary then was only fore-ordained for JESUS' sake, because she was to be His Mother, without having man as His father, that is, that her blood and her flesh were to concur in unity of principle in the formation of Him Who is both GOD and man; and JESUS CHRIST was

fore-ordained, only that he might redeem man with *His most precious Blood, Which is That Which He hath taken from Mary.* "The Author of all things derived His origin from her, and *from her body received the blood which was to be shed for the life of the world; He took of her what He was also to pay for her.*" The decree of the Mother's fore-ordainment is enclosed in that of her Son. Who is JESUS and the CHRIST. JESUS must be Purity Itself; it must needs be fitting, that she of whom He was to be born "should by him have been purified from sin, and in that her purity from Him, He was taken from her; and since the purity of His Mother, whereby he was pure, was only from Him, thus also it was from Himself and by Himself that He was pure." "Yea, it was fitting that with purity, *than which no greater can be conceived short of God Himself, should that Virgin be arrayed*, to whom God the Father so purposed to give His Only-Begotten Son, Whom being born of Himself, Coequal with Himself, He loved as Himself, that One and the Same should be by nature Son of GOD the Father and of the Virgin; she, whom the Son Himself chose to make to be a mother to Himself of her substance; she, of whom the HOLY SPIRIT willed, and was about to operate, that He should be conceived and born, of Whom Himself proceeded."—pp. 52—54.

Here, then, it is distinctly stated that the purity of the Virgin is so great that "no greater can be conceived short of God himself." And no less clearly is it intimated that the blood by which man was redeemed was the blood of Mary. It is in vain to attempt to escape from this conclusion. For if it were not the blood of Mary, then the fact of its being shed for the sins of mankind, could be no reason for its being necessarily endued with all but infinite purity in *her* conception. As to exposing

the fallacy of such an argument—if it deserves such a name—it is needless. The argument proves either nothing at all, or a vast deal too much. But be it valid or not, can any one living imagine what object Dr. Pusey could have in preparing such a work for the members of the English Church?

CHAPTER XIII.

THE SUBJECT CONTINUED: DR. PUSEY'S DOCTRINE CONCERNING THE VIRGIN MARY.

The more I examine the works which Dr. Pusey is at present publishing for the use of the members of the church of England, the more difficult I find it to understand, how any one could desire to put such books into circulation, who had not already been reconciled to the communion of the church of Rome. That, however, may be considered a personal question, and as such, I have no wish to touch it,—although the answer would, no doubt, throw considerable light on the character of the movement in which he takes so conspicuous a part. But, whatever may be the truth as far as *that* question is concerned, this much is certain—that the adaptations of Roman-catholic writings, which he has taken the trouble to prepare and publish, could not be calculated more effectually to insinuate the errors of popery, and prepare the public mind for a complete reception of them, if they had been edited by a professed member of the order of Jesuits. The extracts I have given in the preceding chapter, are demonstrative, that, although Dr. Pusey may not yet have begun to teach the English Church to worship the Virgin, *as* the church of Rome does, he has laid in these books the foundation for every development of error which

he may, by-and-by, think fit to advocate. Romish writers may have expressed themselves with less caution: but, as far as the theory is concerned, there is no substantial difference between their doctrine and that of Dr. Pusey and Mr. Newman.

Any one who considers Mr. Newman's arguments to prove the necessity of the purity of the Virgin Mary's nature, and her "*present* power and influence;" and likewise the passages I have quoted from Dr. Pusey's *adaptation* of Avrillon, in which it is maintained that no greater purity than the Virgin's can be conceived short of God himself; and that this was fitting, and indeed, necessary, because it was from her body the Lord received the blood which was to be shed for the life of the world;—any one who calmly considers what such language means, and must mean, will not think it at all too much to say, that there is no substantial difference between this and the doctrine of the Romish writers. And, indeed, if it had been felt that any serious misapprehension regarding their designs could have been caused by their adopting such language, it is in the last degree improbable, that Mr. Newman would have committed such passages to press, or that Dr. Pusey would have selected such works as these for translation and adaptation. For, let it never be forgotten,—these books are *adaptations*, and are stated by Dr. Pusey to be so; and not merely translations. He continually acknowledges

such an amount of alterations, as must compel any one who reads the books to feel, that unless one had the originals before him, it would be impossible to form any conjecture, how much was Avrillon's,—for example,—and how much was Dr. Pusey's. So that it is absolutely certain Dr. Pusey has made himself responsible for every word and syllable contained in these books. They must, in fact, be taken as nothing less than the deliberate enunciation of the doctrines which he desires at present to propagate. To return, then, to his adaptation of Avrillon's Guide for passing Advent Holily. The third Wednesday in Advent, Avrillon calls "the Day of Grace," and this is Dr. Pusey's adaptation of the Meditation.

MEDITATION UPON GRACE.

TAKEN FROM THE GOSPEL. FIRST PART.

Hail, full of Grace, the Lord is with thee. (Luke, i. 28.)

Here direct thy whole attention to this heavenly interview between the holy Gabriel and Mary, for in it wilt thou both discover all the most lovely features of grace, and wilt hear the deepest, the most impenetrable, and the most important of all the Mysteries of our religion treated of, even that which is the greatest of all the Mysteries of grace, and the fountain of all mercies; namely, the Mystery of the Incarnation, which was fulfilled in Mary at the moment she accepted the message of the Angel, who was speaking to her on the part of GOD.

This was an *interview between two Angels and two Virgins*, for Angels are Virgins, and Virgins are Angels; the one from Heaven, the other of earth; and though both then on earth, yet both of Heaven. Here grace shone

most brightly; for the more the Angel exalted Mary, the more she abased herself; the more he spoke, *the more she kept silence;* and it was this humility which made her grace shine so brightly. Gather then from hence, that if thou wouldst obtain the grace of thy Lord, thou must begin by humbling thyself, for the measure of grace is that of humility, and GOD, Who "resisteth the proud, giveth grace to the humble."

"Hail, thou that art full of grace, the Lord is with thee," said the Angel: "He Who is before thee, to-day is with thee, and shortly shall be of thee; the one in eternity, the other in time. O boundless Loving-kindness! O the gracious goodness of GOD! It sufficed not to point out the joy, without mention of the Author of that joy, in the Virgin-Birth. The words, "the Lord is with thee," show plainly the presence of the Lord Himself, wholly Incarnate in her, yet going not forth from His own glory. "Hail, full of grace, the Lord is with thee." Joy, thou instrument of joy." Yea, indeed, how blessed to possess not only grace, but the fulness of grace! Remember, however, that *Mary was not as yet the Mother of* GOD, she was not so until a little while after these words, *for the* HOLY GHOST *vouchsafed to await her consent*, ere working within her chaste womb that Incarnation of the WORD which raised her to the sacred quality of Mother of GOD, and heaped upon her yet new graces infinitely more sublime and more abundant:

If the Incarnation had not yet taken place, how could "the words, *the Lord is with thee*, show plainly the presence of the Lord Himself, wholly Incarnate in her," as Dr. Pusey has just stated?

nevertheless she was already "full of grace;" but from that moment did the HOLY SPIRIT give *her soul a new capacity for containing larger grace than all men and Angels together*, THAT "through her might come forth that inef-

fable Grace, whereof the Apostle spake aloud, 'the saving grace of GOD hath appeared unto all men;' through her might come forth the True Light, our Lord JESUS CHRIST, Who saith in the Gospel, 'I am the Light of the world,' 'the Light Who lighteneth every one that cometh into the world,' and we might 'have JESUS through that same Spirit by Whom she conceived JESUS.'"—pp. 122—125.

Why the infinite grace which was to reside in Christ, should render it necessary, that the soul of Mary should receive "a new capacity for containing larger grace than all men and angels together," Dr. Pusey has not attempted to prove,—any more than he has adduced any proof or testimony of his assertion, that she did receive such a capacity, or such a measure of grace. The whole statement is pure fiction; but it is a fiction invented for the purpose of exalting the Virgin to all but Godhead.

CHAPTER XIV.

THE SUBJECT CONTINUED: THE MONTH OF MARY — THE GLORIES OF MARY—DR. PUSEY'S DOCTRINE—HIS LETTER TO DR. JELF.

My reader will have observed, that, whatever alterations Dr. Pusey may have made in this adaptation of Avrillon, he has not omitted that idea, so common among Romish writers,—for which, it is needless to say, they have not a shadow of authority in Scripture,—that the Holy Ghost awaited Mary's consent (on which consent, Romish writers tell us, the salvation of the world depended)—an idea which Mr. Oakeley also has preserved in his Life of Christ, where he tells his reader to put himself in the presence of God, and contemplate the Blessed Trinity awaiting the answer and consent of this beloved daughter.

How Roman-catholic writers treat this subject is notorious. The following passage, in a volume in extensive circulation among Romanists—The Month of Mary—will give a sufficiently clear example:

What a momentous mission was that on which the archangel Gabriel was sent to Mary, when he announced to her that she should conceive and bear a son, who was to be called Jesus, because he was to "save his people from their sins."

On the assent of the Virgin to the proposition made her, hung the destinies of the human race. How the angels of God must have paused in breathless expectation of her

answer! And when they heard issue from her mouth the words: "Behold the handmaid of the Lord: be it done unto me according to thy word;" how the vaults of heaven resounded with the glorious anthem of "Glory to God on high and peace to men of good will," which, on the night of Christ's nativity, re-echoed from the earth! *What would have been our condition if Mary had not yielded this ready compliance with God's will? We have every reason to conclude, that man would not have been redeemed.* God could, of course, have employed other means; *but there is nothing to make us believe that he would have done so. On the contrary, all that we know of the ordinary course of his providence, tends to warrant the contrary inference.*—pp. 50, 51.

The Glories of Mary also, the work of Alphonsus Liguori, will furnish another illustration:

What do the fathers, the doctors of the church teach us, by texts so strong and so precise? Do they intend to prove, that all graces come to us through Mary in this sense only, that she has given us the Author of grace, as our adversary would fain persuade us? Far from it, they on the contrary, give clearly to understand, that every grace given to man in virtue of the merits of Jesus Christ, is conveyed to him by the hands of Mary. This is the conclusion of the venerable Father Suarez, S. J. He writes: "It is now the general sentiment of the church, that the intercession of the mother of God, is not only useful, but even necessary to salvation."—"For the Lord," says St. Bernard, "wishes to grant us nothing, without the agency of Mary." Before him, St. Ildephonsus said to the holy Virgin: "O glorious Lady! the Lord has confided to you all the gifts he wishes to dispense to his creatures—all the treasures of grace are committed to your care." St. Peter Damian goes still further, asking himself this question: "*Why has God before he became incar-*

nate in Mary's womb, applied for her consent? For two reasons," he replies; "First, *to oblige us to be very grateful to her:* and secondly, *to teach us that our salvation depends on the will of this blessed Virgin.*"—pp. 122, 123.

Such is the use the Romish writers make of this fiction. But, perhaps Dr. Pusey was not aware of this; or, it may be, he failed at the moment to recollect that this fiction had ever been turned to a purpose so fearful. I should be thankful to have any reason to believe either supposition to be true. But the facts of the case render it impossible that they could. The words, as he has adapted them for the use of the church of England, are, "Mary was not yet the mother of God, she was not so until a little while after these words, for *the Holy Ghost vouchsafed to await her consent* ere working within her chaste womb the Incarnation of the Word—" These are the words in his adaptation of Avrillon; and to the word "await" he has put the following note at the foot of the page.

* Attendait. There is often, in writers of the Roman communion, a mode of speaking on this "awaiting of the consent" of St. Mary, which gives us *a sort of shock*, as though they were intent on magnifying the creature, whose consent was awaited, rather than the unutterable condescension of the Creator, Who vouchsafed to make His dispensations of mercy wait on the conformity of the will of His creature with His own. Yet so that it be kept prominently in mind, that all is of GOD's grace and overwhelming condescension, it is, of course, an acknowledged truth, that GOD in all His designs towards man, does make them depend upon the concurrence of the will of His

creature, to whom He has first given grace and power to will what He willeth, with his own. He forms His own instruments, so that they shall accomplish that for which He forms them; yet they become His instruments, by responding freely, with that will which He has made free, to his grace, and concurring with His purposes in and through them.—[Ed.]

Now one might have thought that the language of Romish writers, such as is quoted above—language which it is not too much to call blasphemous and profane, should have made any sane person cautious of indulging his imagination where the Holy Scripture is silent. What authority has any one to endeavour to penetrate into the mystery of the Incarnation, and conjecture, (I shall not say—dogmatically assert,) what the Holy Spirit has thought fit to conceal? Who that has any humility, any fear of God, any reverence for holy things, any regard for truth, will presume to take such liberties—will feel the slightest desire to do so—will feel anything but an instinctive horror and recoiling from such intrusion into secret things—such mixture of truth and falsehood in the most sacred mystery of our religion. But waving this, I cannot imagine how any person that has any acquaintance with Holy Scripture can believe, that the Divine purpose and promise of redeeming the human race, could have been frustrated by the unbelief or disobedience of any particular person, who should refuse to bear her allotted part as an instrument in the work of redemption? The doctrine

is as false as the supposition is indecent. But Dr. Pusey defends it. And, what is worst of all, he not only defends the statement as a doctrinal truth, but he glosses over the manner in which it is treated by Romanists,—as a "*mode of speaking*" "which gives us a sort of shock." *A sort of shock!* Truly, that mind must be in a most deplorable state which can speak thus lightly of such language as has been quoted from Liguori and the Month of Mary, as giving one "a sort of shock." Is it not the doctrine delivered by Liguori as the doctrine of his church, that God, before he became incarnate in Mary's womb, *applied for her consent*, in order "to teach us that our salvation depends on the will of this blessed Virgin"? Is it not the doctrine taught in the Month of Mary that "if Mary had not yielded this ready compliance with God's will," "man would not have been redeemed"? Is this what a clergyman of the church of England—what any one but a Roman-catholic, and not a very moderate one either—will call "*a mode of speaking*" "which gives us *a sort of shock*"? Is this language which any one but a partisan of Rome would undertake to palliate, as requiring only to be properly understood, in order to its being seen to contain nothing more than an "acknowledged truth"?

But what grounds have I for assuming that Dr. Pusey had ever seen the "Glories of Mary"? This question may occur to the reader, and it may be right

to satisfy him on the subject, though in all probability, some will not have forgotten that "the Glories of Mary" is a book with which Dr. Pusey is well acquainted. At the end of his letter to Dr. Jelf, in vindication of the interpretation of the articles advocated by Mr. Newman in the Tract No. 90, Dr. Pusey added an Appendix from Archbishop Ussher, on the difference between ancient and modern addresses to Saints; and to this Appendix he annexed a Postscript. A few extracts will serve to prove that he is not unacquainted with "the Glories of Mary:"

Since the above has been in type, I have been furnished with a melancholy confirmation of the truth of Mr. Newman's words, that the received "doctrine of the Roman schools of that day" is "unhappily that of this day too;" that

> "The present authoritative teaching of the Church of Rome, to judge by what we see of it in public, goes very far indeed to substitute another Gospel for the true one. Instead of setting before the soul the Holy Trinity—it does seem to me as a popular system to preach the Blessed Virgin and the Saints."

It would probably be a first impression on reading these extracts from Abp. Ussher, that he had with much learning brought together a mass of objectionable language, which it might be hoped was now done away; that all these were the exaggerations of individual minds, and that it was not fair to charge them as teaching now received in the Roman Church. This was my own hope; I reprinted them in illustration of the meaning of the Article, but certainly, little thinking of imputing them to Rome at the present day. The contrary, however, of all this is sadly the case. The same extracts which Abp. Ussher adduces

as illustrating the difference between "the Romish doctrine of the invocation of Saints" and ancient addresses to them, are, in "the Glories of Mary Mother of God by Saint Alphonsus Liguori, and carefully revised by a Catholic Priest," (third ed. Dublin, 1837,) adduced as authoritative teaching. The subjects of the early chapters, which they are adduced to establish, are "how great should be our confidence in Mary Queen of Mercy," (§. 1.) "as our mother," (§. 2.) "the great love borne us by Mary, our Mother," (§. 3.) that "Mary is *the* refuge of repentant sinners" and so (§. 4.) "our life, since she obtains us the pardon of our sins," (c. 2. §. 1.) "because she obtains us perseverance," (§. 2.) "the *necessity* of Mary's intercession in order to obtain salvation," (c. 5.) &c. The sayings of Bernardine of Sienna, Albertus M., Bonaventure, &c. are alleged as authorities. It is still alleged as a true saying, "All is subject to Mary's empire, even God," (p. 138, see Abp. Ussher, above p. 196.) It is not, of course, to be supposed that no mention should be made of her SON, or from time to time that her intercession is available through her SON, or that "Jesus is our Redeemer, Mary our Advocate," (p. 88.) "Jesus is my only hope, and after Him you, O Virgin Mary." (p. 90.) One could not imagine anything written by a Christian in entire forgetfulness of his Lord; but these are but scanty; the main object of the work is, (as it professes,) "the Glories of Mary," and these are so set forth, as for the most part to end in her, to place her where a Catholic would expect mention of his Lord.—pp. 204, 5.

Dr. Pusey then went on to quote several passages at length from the "Glories of Mary," to prove the erroneous nature of the Romish system. His conclusion is too remarkable to be omitted:—

Lastly, it should be noticed that there is an essential difference between the way in which men's salvation is in

any passages of the fathers said to be derived through S. Mary, and that in which it is attributed to her by these later writers. The object of S. Irenæus and other fathers, in the first place, is not to magnify S. Mary, but to point out the reality of the Incarnation, which was denied by the Gnostic heretics; but then, further, the benefits are said to be derived through her, in that, of her according to the flesh, Christ was born; in the later writers, they are attributed to her by virtue of the dignity, *since* bestowed upon her: in the fathers, they are spoken as coming from her indirectly, in later writers, directly; in the fathers, from her when on earth, in later writers, from her in Heaven; in the fathers from the Nativity of our Lord, later, from *her* sovereignty, rule, Intercession, Command, with which for her merits she is alleged to be invested. The expressions of the fathers do not go beyond St. Paul's words, "Adam was not deceived, but, the woman being deceived was in the transgression: notwithstanding, she shall be saved through the childbearing," as though the blessed fact that our Lord was "born of a woman" had some mysterious relation to the fall by a woman; that there is a correspondence between death coming through the transgression of the woman and life coming through her. In the "Glories of Mary" it is expressly denied that this is the sense in which the modern sayings should be taken.

"That God has constituted Mary the ordinary dispensatrix of His graces, was the opinion of St. Bernard: it is now the common opinion of all theologians, and all doctors. It is taught by Tega, Mendozza, Poire, Pacciuchelli, Segneri, Crasset, and a crowd of others. Even Father Noel Alexander, so reserved in his propositions, says, 'That God wishes that all the favours men expect from Him, they should be indebted for to the intercession of Mary.'"

"But this doctrine does not please a certain modern author: this person, who otherwise speaks with much piety and learning, of true and false devotion, is very parsimonious when there is question of the worship of the holy

> Virgin, refusing her that glory, and those privileges, which a St. Germanus, a St. Anselm, a St. John Damascene, St. Bonaventure, a St. Antonius, a St. Bernardine of Sienna, and innumerable other holy doctors, made no difficulty to grant her. He pretends that the aforesaid proposition, 'God confers no grace but through Mary's intercession,' is an hyperbole which fervour caused some saints to utter, and that it is only correct in this sense, that, 'Mary has given to the world, Jesus the Author of grace;' for, adds he, the apostle formally teaches, that we acknowledge but One sole Mediator between God and man—viz., the Word made flesh."—(p. 116, 7.)

It is for earnest-minded Romanists seriously to consider the tendency of all this; Faith is not holding truth in the abstract, it must penetrate the life and run through a man's whole belief; worldly-minded persons are often, in the whole habit of their mind, Socinians, although if asked they would acknowledge or think that they believed the Divinity and Atonement of our Lord; and *persons may be practically worshippers of the Blessed Virgin only, while they would acknowledge in the abstract that she derives all her power from her Son.* It ought probably to awaken some fears in them that *they habitually contemplate and speak of S. Mary as "the Mother of God" only*, still speak of our Lord, in reference to her, as her Son only; there may be in this a subtle Humanitarianism, which, while they are encouraged to shrink from the thought of their Lord as their Judge, thinks of Him only as the Son of Mary, and *while it acknowledges S. Mary as the Mother of God, practically forgets that He created her*, and *in that they hold her to have been without sin, denies that He redeemed her.* The term "Mother of God" expresses Catholic truth; *yet may it be, and it is, continually used by Romanists in an heretical sense.*

While these things are so, although we did not separate from Rome, yet since God has permitted that Rome should separate us from her, *we see not how the Anglican*

Church could re-unite with her, without betraying the trust which she owes to her own children.—pp. 215—217.

Such was Dr. Pusey's language in 1841. Little, perhaps, did many suppose that, in 1845, he would have been employed in poisoning the minds of his countrymen by his adaptations of such works as Avrillon's and Surin's. But now he is found propagating some of the most erroneous and unscriptural doctrines of Romanists on this very subject. Indeed, in a note to the preface to his adaptation of Surin, he seems to apologise for what he had formerly said of the "Glories of Mary;" at least, if this be not included in his retractation, he should certainly have guarded himself from misapprehension. The note referred to is as follows:—

> The editor would take this opportunity of saying, that nothing was ever further from his intention than criticising *any whom he knew to be Saints of God.* In anything he ever said, *he was following, he hopes, authority, or regarding words only in themselves, or in what seemed their natural or unavoidable effect on ordinary minds*, such as his own, quite abstractedly from those who used them.—p. viii.

What this may be intended to refer to, it may be fruitless to conjecture; but certainly, a Romanist would be apt to suppose, that Dr. Pusey intended it to be taken as an apology for the manner in which he had formerly spoken of St. Alphonsus Liguori's work,—whatever else might be intended by it.

CHAPTER XV.

REVIEW OF DR. PUSEY'S DOCTRINE CONCERNING THE VIRGIN MARY CONTINUED—MR. OAKELEY'S MEDITATION ON THE ANNUNCIATION.

To return, however, to Dr. Pusey's adaptation of the Meditation of Avrillon:—

SECOND PART.

"And Mary said, Behold the handmaid of the Lord; be it unto me according to Thy word." (Luke i. 38.)

After having fixed thy attention upon the fulness of grace in the Blessed Mary, thou must again direct it anew to her acquiescence and humble submission to this grace, in order to profit by her great example, and to learn to submit thyself to its guidance the moment it approaches thee; this is the lesson thou shouldst derive from thy reflections upon this mystery of grace.

The surpassing love of virginity cherished by this Virgin, "*purer and holier than the whole human race*," united to her deep humility, had "troubled" her. "Shall I, she thought, alone of women, form a new thing in nature? Can I alone bear a Fruit alone? What may be this salutation? Who that hath brought me this promise, and whence is he?" "She answered with modesty because she feared, with prudence because she marvelled at this new form of benediction, which was never used, never before known. To Mary alone was this salutation reserved. For well is she alone called "full of grace," who alone had obtained that grace, which none besides attained, to be filled with the Author of grace."

But *as soon as she was sure of remaining ever virgin*, and that it was God Himself Who desired to exalt her lowliness to the awful dignity of the Divine Motherhood, she expressed her consent by these beautiful words: "Be-

hold the handmaid of the Lord; be it unto me according to Thy word:" and she had no sooner pronounced them, than *she felt herself* wholly filled with His Divinity, and consequently with Grace, because she had conceived the Author of all Grace.—pp. 125, 126.

Will Dr. Pusey say—What authority does the Word of God give to this notion, that the *trouble* the Virgin felt at the appearance of the Angel arose from her "surpassing love of virginity"?—what authority does it give to the assumption, that she had been pledged by a vow,—or in any other way whatever,—to perpetual virginity, and that she suspended her consent to become the Mother of the Lord, until she had been made "sure of remaining ever virgin"? What authority, what countenance do the words either of the Angel or of Mary, as recorded by the inspired Evangelist, give for any one of these assumptions? None whatever. Really one cannot help asking one's self again and again, where is all this to end? If people will allow themselves to weave such monstrous fictions on the text of that word, which the fear of God should have led them to approach with greater reverence, it is folly to suppose the evil can end there. The tendency of such writing *within* the church of Rome is mischievous enough. Yet *there*, much of it is likely to be read without much attention to its meaning; because it is the language men have been accustomed to from their childhood, and some, perhaps many, may adopt it from force of habit, without attaching

any very definite idea to it. But for a clergyman of our church to do violence to all his natural feelings, and all the habits of mind induced by education and association in an English university, for such a person to trifle—and to teach others to trifle—in this way, with the Word of God, in support of a baseless superstition,—the end is most likely to be nothing short of Neologianism; nor is it very easy to imagine, that any one thus educated could ever have brought himself to take such liberties with Revelation, unless his regard for truth had, at some former period of his life, been undermined by a semi-infidel system of explaining away the inspired records. The step from English theology to such irreverence for Holy Scripture seems almost unaccountable on any other supposition.

This mode of perverting the language of St. Luke is pursued in a subsequent meditation, the "Day of Modesty." The manner in which Dr. Pusey endeavours to defend the errors of the Romanists in his notes to this passage, is so remarkable, that I think it better to print them along with the words to which they refer:—

Mary is "troubled" by the saying of the Angel, *because, though she is a Virgin, and a Virgin pure as*[1] *Angels,*

[1] "Purer than." Orig. Yet this refers to the time before the Conception. For, *by the Conception, indeed, any one who meditates on the mystery of the Incarnation, must think that the Blessed Virgin has a nearness to* GOD, *closer than that of any other created being;* in the words of St. Gregory the Great, "by

yet he speaks to her of becoming a mother: a second reason of her uneasiness, and a second proof of her excellent modesty. How useful is this example of modesty to Christian virgins, and how it is worthy of their attention!

Be often present in spirit at this Heavenly interview between Mary and the Angel of the LORD; go to the school of wisdom of this wisest and purest of maidens; for there wilt thou learn that modesty which so beseemeth thy sex; there wilt thou learn not to see men, except through necessity, and then even with fear; not to converse with them, except with circumspection; not to reply to them, but with bashfulness; not to hear their praises and their flatteries, except with terror. Deeply engrave on thy heart the portrait of Mary whilst discoursing with the holy Gabriel, albeit he was an Angel sent from GOD; the modesty of her looks, the purity of her sentiments, the exactness of her replies, the disquietude of her mind, and the innocent trouble of her heart, will teach thee, that thou shouldest ever be in fear and trembling, even though thou wert speaking to Angels.

Mary was the purest of Virgins; and *the supreme love she had for her virgin state had separated her from her infancy from the world, in order to consecrate her virginity*[2]

the dignity of her election she transcends all elevation of all elected creatures. Is not Mary a 'high mountain,' who, that she might reach unto the Conception of the Eternal World, reared the eminence of her attainment above all the choirs of Angels, *even to the Throne of Deity?*" (On 1 Kings, c. 1, § 5.) See others, (as Chrysippus Hieros. A. 455; "*The Heavenly Queen,*") ap. Petav. de Incarn. xiv. 8. [ED.] Dr. Pusey's note.

[2] St. Augustine infers from the answer of the Blessed Virgin (Luke i. 34), that she was under a vow of virginity, *for there had been no ground to marvel had she been betrothed under the ordinary laws of marriage.* "This she would not have said, unless she had previously vowed herself as a Virgin to GOD. But because the customs of the Israelites as yet admitted not of this, she was betrothed to "a just man," who should not by violence rob, but rather guard against the vio-

to GOD *in the Temple.*[3] Judge, then, *if a heart as pure as hers could hear her future motherhood*[4] *spoken of without her modesty being frightened by it*, and without that virgin heart experiencing that interior and mysterious "trouble" which *tinged, even up to her forehead*, those innocent features where her purity and modesty were engraved.

Nevertheless, Mary assents, because GOD commands her to do so by the mouth of this heavenly spirit, and *she is now sure of remaining ever Virgin*, despite her Maternity, and humble, despite her Greatness: and she shows, by declaring herself the "handmaid of the LORD," that obedience to the orders of GOD, and modesty, are blended in her heart.—pp. 132—134.

Now, to any one who has reverence enough for

lent, what she had already vowed. Although had she only said, "How shall this be?" without adding what follows, assuredly she would not have inquired this, how, as a married woman, she shou d bear the promised Son, had she been wedded under the laws of marriage." S. Aug. de S. Virg. c. 4. S. Greg. Nyss. makes the same inference, de die nat. Dom. t. iii. p. 347, quoted by Petav. de Incarn. xiv. c. 5. [ED.] Dr. Pusey's note.

[3] This rests on distinct ground, from *the fact* of the Blessed Virgin's vow of virginity. The earliest statement to this effect is in a history quoted as "apocryphal" by S. Greg. Nyss. l. c., who says, that it is so far authenticated, in that *Holy Scripture shows that she was under a vow* (*vide previous note.*) Tillemont (note v. sur la S. Vierge) disparages the history. There is one very grave historical error in it, that the Mother of S. Mary prayed "within the holy of holies:" else the history has analogy in the offering of Samuel, and the education of Josiah (2 Kings, xi.), and Anna "departed not from the temple," day or night, "for fourscore and four years." S. Ambrose did not know of the history, for he says, "she went not forth from her house, except to the Church" ["Temple," for he is speaking of her early life]. De Virg. ii. 2. 10. Dr. Pusey's note.

[4] "The Angel announces the Birth, but she clings to her Virgin state, judging integrity to be more honourable than the manifestation of the Angel." S. Greg. Nyss. l. c. Dr. Pusey's note.

sacred things to take the Word of God as His Spirit has seen fit to indite it, it really must appear perfectly amazing, how any human being could presume to take such liberties with a Divine Revelation. But the evil lies deeper than this. No person who had any real regard for truth would tamper with any historical document whatever. If we know more of what passed at the Annunciation than St. Luke did, and have private sources of information regarding the history of the Virgin Mary, to which the Evangelists had no access,—let it be said so. But if not, then such treatment of the only authentic records we have, is incompatible with truth and honesty; and, if it gain toleration in the church, it must shake men's faith in the evangelical history altogether. The Evangelists, so far from saying anything that could lead to the notion of Mary's having taken a vow of virginity, will tell us that she was a wife. Her astonishment at the words of the Angel needs no further explanation, than she was still in the period of betrothment. And this would be obvious to any one, who had not allowed himself to indulge his imagination in fanciful and mystical explanations. It is worth while to compare with this passage of Dr. Pusey's adaptation, Mr. Oakeley's account of the matter in his translation of Bonaventure. One or two sentences I have transcribed already; but it is well to put the whole passage before the reader, not only on account of its

similarity to Dr. Pusey's meditation, but as a specimen of the manner in which this school treats the Holy Scriptures:—

When the fulness of time was now come, the Ever-blessed Trinity having decreed to redeem mankind by the Incarnation of the WORD, it pleased ALMIGHTY GOD to summon to Him the Archangel Gabriel, and send him to Nazareth, *to a Virgin espoused to a man whose name was Joseph, and the Virgin's name was Mary.* Gabriel, with a calm and beaming countenance, reverently and devoutly prostrate before the Throne of God, listens to the gracious message, and accepts the embassy. Then, rising on the wings of joy, he quits the heavenly courts, and is instantly present, in human shape, before the Virgin Mary, whom he discovers in the innermost retreat of her lowly dwelling. Yet not so rapid was his flight, but that *the Blessed Trinity, preventing their ambassador, was in the dwelling before him.*

For you must know, that although the Person of the Son alone was made Man, yet the Whole Blessed Trinity took part in His Incarnation, the Father and the Holy Ghost co-operating with the Son in this august mystery. Here then be specially attentive, and try to embrace all that passes, as if present at the sacred scene. O what scope may not be afforded for your meditation in that lowly dwelling, where *such Personages* are assembled, and such unutterable Mysteries accomplished! For though the Holy Trinity be undoubtedly always everywhere present, yet, in this place, on this occasion, you must conceive It present in a more especial way, by reason of the unspeakable work then and there effected. The Angel Gabriel, then, *this faithful proxy* of the heavenly Bridegroom, having come into the presence of the blessed Virgin, thus began his message: "Hail, full of grace! the Lord is with thee: Blessed art thou among women." To which, not a little disturbed, she made no answer. Her disturbance,

however, proceeded not from any guilty confusion within her; nor could it be occasioned by the sight of the Angel, for *to such sights she was well accustomed.* But, in the words of the Evangelist, "*She was troubled at his saying, and cast in her mind what manner of salutation this should be,*" so unlike *his u ual manner of greeting her.* Nor could the lowly Virgin be otherwise than disturbed at the threefold praise contained in this salutation. To hear herself commended because full of grace, because the Lord was with her, and she blessed above all women, was more than one so rich in humility could bear without a blush of emotion. Her discomposure then was wholly the effect of a virtuous and becoming bashfulness. Moreover, she was not without fear of giving too easy credence to the tidings. Not that she mistrusted in the least the Angel's word; but it is ever the manner of the truly humble rather to dwell upon their failings than to weigh their merits, and thus continually to advance towards perfection by taking little account of their high attainments in holiness, and greatly magnifying their least defects. Thus, as became a prudent, fearful, and modest Virgin, our blessed Lady remained silent: for what could she find to answer? Learn from her example the study and practice of silence; for a virtue it is of great price, and serviceable withal. Not till she had heard the Angel *twice* deliver his wondrous message, could she prevail on herself to make any answer; so odious a thing in a virgin is talkativeness. Then the Angel, understanding the reason of her trouble, said, "*Fear not, Mary,* be not abashed by the praises I utter; they are but truth: for thou art not only full of grace thyself, but art to be the means of restoring all mankind to the grace of God, which they have lost. For behold thou shalt conceive, and bring forth the Son of the Highest. He, who has chosen thee to be His Mother, shall save all who put their trust in Him." Then the blessed Virgin, waiving the subject of her praises, *was*

desirous of knowing how all this could come to pass, without the loss of her virgin purity. She, therefore, *inquired of the Angel the manner of the Conception,* "*How shall this be, seeing I know not a man? I have dedicated myself to my Lord by a vow of perpetual virginity.*" "It shall be done (replied the Angel) by the operation of the Holy Ghost, who, in an unspeakable manner, shall overshadow thee, so that by this power thou shalt conceive, *without prejudice to thy virgin purity:* and therefore shall thy son be called the Son of God," &c.—Life of Christ, pp. 9—11.

As I have already stated, I have transcribed this passage here, chiefly on account of its giving the same turn to the Virgin's question as Dr. Pusey does; but the manner in which plain, palpable fictions are foisted into the narrative—such as, that Mary had been *well accustomed* to see visions of Angels, and that she required the Angel to deliver his message *twice*—is exceedingly illustrative of the want of reverence for Scripture and the disregard for truth, which is so continually to be deplored in the writings of this party.

The fable of the Virgin Mary having lived from her childhood in the Temple is repeated by Dr. Pusey in a subsequent meditation, the "Day of Obedience," in this "Guide for passing Advent Holily." The passage contains a variety of circumstances for which the author had to draw on his imagination; for truly, the text itself, "Mary went into the hill country with haste," gave him but small assistance.

Obedience ought to be willing to undertake everything,

even impossibilities: that of Mary was indeed devoted, and could neither be abated by *the steepness of the mountains*, nor *the exceeding heat of the season*, nor by *the tenderness of her age*, nor by *the delicacy of her constitution*, nor by the difficulty of the journey.

How pleasant a sight was it to see this youthful virgin, *scarcely advanced beyond childhood*, courageously walking through *deserts and over mountains*, despite *the extreme heat!* What effect must not the *burning warmth of the sun have had upon her!* for (it is said) since she was three years old she had never before come out of the Temple; and so *this would be her first journey;* but in obedience did she find resources against her weakness; so true is it that he who obeys with readiness and courage finds nothing difficult.—p. 149.

Dr. Pusey has put a note to this passage to inform his reader that he had added the short parenthesis "(it is said.)" It seems he does not choose to vouch for the truth of the fable of the Virgin's residence in the Temple. But why not? No doubt, the temple was not at Nazareth, and Mary was not at Jerusalem;—yet, surely, as far as reverence for Holy Scripture or regard for truth is concerned, this is but a trivial matter amidst such a crowd of mere inventions. "The steepness of the mountains," "the deserts," "the exceeding heat of the season," "the tenderness of her age," "scarcely advanced beyond childhood," "her first journey"—what authority is there for all these particulars? But, what matter? They are edifying; they serve to make up a pleasant sight, and an example of obedience (though what *obedience* had to do with the

matter Dr. Pusey has not explained,) and if so, we may piously imagine them. There *may* have been steep mountains and deserts to be passed; the season *may* have been exceedingly hot; and this *may* have been her first journey, (she must have taken a *first* journey some time or other, and why not then?)—she *may* have had a delicate constitution; and she *may* have been so young as to have scarcely advanced beyond childhood. In effect, as Mr. Oakeley would say:—"You cannot prove me wrong, nor suggest any alteration which is not equally unauthorized, and more improbable. And, at last, what great harm, though I be mistaken? I do no violence to the sacred text; I am guilty of no irreverence towards the holy Persons in question, for reverence towards them is the very basis of my supposition: [a theory which would go far towards justifying idolatry, pious frauds, and what not] and for myself, I rise from such meditation, as I trust, holier and better than I went to it; more indifferent to the world, more dissatisfied with myself, and fuller of love to God and my brethren."*

It may be so: but yet, when these men have succeeded in persuading themselves and their disciples, that, provided they *trust* they are benefited by their religious exercises, it is immaterial whether truth or falsehood form the basis of their devotions, —that it is lawful to take such liberties as these

* Life of Christ, pref. p. vii.

with the Word of God,—and that, when called to account, it is enough to say, "I do no violence to the sacred text—I am guilty of no irreverence to holy persons"—when they have reduced their consciences, and the consciences of their followers, to this state, it can require no great sagacity to foresee that a reaction will take place, such as, in all likelihood, will leave matters, in more particulars than one, in a worse state than before this movement commenced. However the question may be mystified, it is beyond all controversy, that he, who teaches men to trifle with truth, to mix up fact and fiction with their devotions, to seek edification in the flights of a poetical imagination, and to take liberties with the letter of the Word of God—however he may impose on himself by a forced solemnity of manner, by devotional raptures, by mental habits, or by the practice of ascetic mortification—is, in reality, doing the work of the enemy of truth and righteousness, and is undermining men's belief in the religion of the Son of God.

CHAPTER XVI.

DR. PUSEY'S AFFECTIVE PARAPHRASES—THE SIXTH GENERAL COUNCIL.

In a subsequent part of this Guide for passing Advent, there are some "Affective Paraphrases" to "occupy the mind during the day and festival of Christmas." The fourth of these is worth transcribing as a specimen of the sort of devotion which Dr. Pusey thinks it desirable to recommend to the use of the members of the church of England. He has carried his licence of *adaptation* here, (as in other places, it would seem,) to a considerable extent. On the fourth paraphrase, which shall be given presently, he puts the following note:

> The following "Paraphrases" to the 12th inclusive, have been altered from Invocations of the Blessed Virgin to prayers to our Lord, the words being, as far as might be, retained.—Ed.—p. 216.

One might have supposed that finding a prayer to the Virgin, he would have felt it more decent to omit it; and that the bare fact of the same form, mutatis mutandis, being equally suited for an address to the Almighty, and to one of his creatures, would have led him to seek some more wholesome provision for the spiritual wants of a Christian church. Yet this does not appear to have struck him at all; and really when one has read the address,

as he now gives it in his adaptation, it cannot seem very wonderful that it did not. The wonder is, how any one, brought up in the church of England, could endure such an effusion for a moment, even in its present shape.

TEXT.

"Joseph also went up with Mary his espoused wife, being great with child." (Luke ii. 4, 5.)

PARAPHRASE IV.

O my Saviour, Thy Divine Mother was a meet depositary of the most rich and sacred of all treasures; *a goodly chariot bearing the King of kings within her chaste womb; a bed of state, a bed of joy whereon Thou my Saviour mightest repose*, Thou Who art hereafter to be the Spouse of Virgins, of holy souls, and of the whole Church; *the most sacred of all Temples which ever has been, or will be; a holy Altar wherron Thou the Immortal God hast placed Thyself*, clothed with that flesh of ours, which was of the substance of Thy Virgin Mother; with deepest reverence do I adore Thee, O my Saviour, in Thy Divine fulness, which is meet to be adored, not by mankind alone, but by all the Heavenly Host; Thou fillest all things, and Thou art, as Thy well-beloved disciple saith, "full of grace and truth," for Thou art GOD, though *hidden beneath a double veil, even that of Thine Own and of Thy Mother's flesh, O Adorable Fulness!* now our only hope, and for ever the joy of all who have been, who are, and who will be, to the end of time, if they correspond thereto by their faithfulness.

O Infinite Fulness! Whose sacred stream of grace and mercy I am sure of receiving if I am found worthy. Ah, holy JESUS! *surely no sanctuary on earth is so sacred or so worthy of all reverence as was the Virgin at once and Maternal Womb of Thy Mother, since it contained Thee our God and Saviour*, the Lord of Heaven and of earth.

Be gracious unto us, O Immortal GOD! who now abhorrest not the Virgin's womb, and art *about to be born* for the salvation of all men. Translate us, we most earnestly beseech Thee, from the strict tribunal of Thy Justice to that of Thy Divine Mercy; and this we beg, for the sake of Thy glorious name, JESUS.—pp. 216, 217.

This may be catholicity. One begins almost to doubt the evidence of one's senses;—but if such an effusion had been heard from the lips of the wildest fanatic or ranter, it would have been thought rather extravagant. However—again and again it must be repeated—this is a secondary consideration. Is such language scriptural? Is it true? Is it consistent with reverence—is it lawful or innocent—to offer up prayers to the Son of God, as if he were yet unborn? Dr. Pusey and his party may consider it edifying; but if it be false and unscriptural, the feelings it excites, in minds capable of feeling anything but disgusted by it, are and must be nothing better than delusion.

The meditation proceeds—

TEXT.

"Joseph also went up with Mary, his espoused wife, being great with child." (Luke ii. 4, 5.)

PARAPHRASE V.

Be Thou borne, O Son of Righteousness, until Thy rising; but, oh! rise quickly, Thou pure and shining Light, Light eternal, in Whom is no darkness, and Who art to lighten all men in the paths of righteousness and of salvation. Show us Thy Face, O my GOD and Saviour, which as yet Thou hidest, which the Angels so ardently

desire to look upon, and which the Prophets call the "Desired of all nations," "and we shall be saved." Reveal to our eyes that Infant Flesh, more pure than the heavenly spirits, which is to be the instrument of our bliss.

Be thou borne, O Heavenly and glorious Burden, *as far as Bethlehem; no hindrance art Thou to her who beareth Thee on Thy journey; for rather dost Thou upbear her by Thy grace and Divine virtue*, since Thou, Who art her Son, art yet the Almighty GOD: portans a quo portabaris. (S. Bern. Serm.)

But remember, O sweet JESUS! that *for us Thou art borne, and for us too wilt Thou be born*, and live and die, and thus work out our redemption. *Far more noble, indeed, and more sublime is the manner in which Thou dost work out that of Thy Holy Mother, by preventing her from falling:* ours Thou wilt work out, upraising us when fallen; be merciful to us, O merciful Saviour; be Thou our Mediator, according to Thy Name of "Mediator," between GOD and man. Thou who wert born for us in time, grant that at this holy season we may again be born in Thee by new fervour, and may never more be separated from Thee, either in time or in eternity.[3]—pp. 217, 218.

Of course, as Dr. Pusey thinks it necessary that the Virgin Mary should have possessed more than angelic purity, because from her the Lord was to receive the blood which he was to shed for the sins of the world, it is not to be wondered at, that he should believe the Virgin was *prevented from falling*, or that her redemption was worked out in a more noble and more sublime manner than ours. He adds the following note to this passage:—

[3] Some of the Greek fathers of greatest name made no

scruple to infer from some words of Holy Scripture, that S. Mary was not exempt from slight infirmities (as S. Basil, S. Chrysostom, and S. Cyril of Alexandria, Amphilochius also, besides Origen and Tertullian). In the west, Pelagius first makes mention of her sinlessness with other righteous persons, but with the remarkable addition "whom piety must needs confess to be free from sin." S. Aug. in answer, sets the question aside, not as certain but as irreverent to discuss: "Expecting [*sic*, a misprint for *excepting*] then, the Holy Virgin Mary, of whom, out of reverence to the Lord, I will make no mention, when the question is of sin; for how know we what greater grace to conquer all sin was conferred on her, to whom it was vouchsafed to conceive and bear Him, of Whom it is certain that He had no sin." This hint and natural feeling seem to have been followed in the Western Church, although Eadmer (A. 1121.) still speaks of her being cleansed at the Incarnation, "from any remains, if such there were, of original or actual sin." The Council of Trent *does not so much rule it, as declares it to be the received belief of the Church;* "No one can, his whole life through, avoid all even venial sins, except by a special privilege of God, *as the Church holds of the Blessed Virgin.*" The statement of Sophronius, Patriarch of Jerusalem, *that Mary was holy, pure, God-minded, free from all spot in body, soul, and understanding*, was received by the sixth Œcumenical Council, *and so by us also.* (From Pet. de Inc. xiv. 1.)—[Ed.]—pp. 218, 219.

It is exceedingly painful to express a doubt of any man's integrity of whom one would hope better things. And, indeed, we must always recollect, that trifling with truth and manufacturing authorities, when grown into a habit, may lead a man to do that, almost unconsciously, which in another, would be nothing less than deliberate dishonesty

and fraud. Any one but moderately experieneed in controversial writing, will have had abundant opportunity of confirming the truth of this observation. Does Dr. Pusey mean to assert, that the church of England, since the Reformation, has ever eommitted itself to the doctrine, that Mary was "free from all spot in body, soul, and understanding?" It seems scarcely credible, and yet the last sentence in this note seems to imply this. However, this is not the first time that Dr. Pusey has asserted that the sixth general council is received by the church of England. I think it right to notice this, because it affords an instance of the manner in which authorities are alleged by this party.

In his letter to Dr. Jelf, he states, that "our Church receives the six Œcumenical Councils;" and in proof of this, he says, in a note, "the homilies speak of these six councils, which were allowed and received by all men;" and cites the homily against Peril of Idolatry. But, any one who will turn to the homily will see, that, however a few words thus picked out of their context may be made in this way to serve a purpose, the homily makes no assertion whatever about the church of England having received any of the six general councils—but merely states the estimation in which the six councils were held in the eighth century. The point aimed at in the homily is, to show the cause of the schism between the Greeks and Latins —and it ascribes its

origin to the offence which the Greeks took, in consequence of Constantine, Bishop of Rome, having—

> caused the images of the ancient fathers, which had been at those six councils *which were allowed and received of all men*, to be painted in the entry of St. Peter's Church, at Rome.

From which it is plain, that the words on which Dr. Pusey relies, are most unfairly cited by him, it being obvious to any one who will read the sentence and context with attention, that the sole object of the words, "which were allowed and received of all men," is to show that the displeasure of the Greeks did not arise from their making any question as to the authority or orthodoxy of any one of the six councils—but from the fact of images having been painted in a church. The words can mean nothing else—and if Dr. Pusey had but observed, that the homilist does not say, "*the* six Councils which *are* allowed and received of all men,"—but "*those* six Councils which *were* allowed and received of all men,"—he must have seen that to cite them as he has done, is to give them a meaning which they cannot bear. But even if the word had been "*are*" and not "*were*," how could the homily serve his *present* purpose? In 1841, he cited the homily in order to help towards establishing his unfounded distinction between General and Œcumenical Councils. Now, he cites it to support the Romish doctrine of the sinlessness of the Virgin Mary.

But, supposing the words of the homily had been intended to declare that "our Church *receives* the six Œcumenical Councils,"—as Dr. Pusey cites it,—suppose the homily to pledge our church to all the doctrines determined in every one of them—and even to exclude these six (as he will have it) from the number of those general councils which the article declares "have erred," how will this serve his present purpose? Does he really mean it to be believed, that by any such general reception of the council, the church of England could be committed to every word in the letter of Sophronius?* If not, what end can this reference to the sixth council serve, except to impose on his reader, in a manner which has too much appearance of disingenuousness?

This, however, is a digression. Still it will help to show by what arts superstitions and errors are now sought to be propagated.

Our business just now is with Dr. Pusey's adaptation from Avrillon: and for the present, it will suffice to extract another passage from these paraphrases. Whether it be the Lord or his Mother, who is most honoured in them, it is not easy to say; but we can hardly avoid remembering, that Dr. Pusey has in-

* As to the meaning of Sophronius' words, I have not thought it worth while to enter on that question here. Whatever they mean, it is preposterous to attempt to make the Church of England appear pledged to them. Dr. Pusey seems to have taken them at second-hand, from Petavius the Jesuit.

formed us, they were, originally, invocations of the Virgin:—

TEXT.

"And she brought forth her first-born Son." (Luke ii. 7.)

PARAPHRASE X.

O blessed JESUS, Thou the Saviour of all mankind, art now brought forth, Thou Who art the Virgin's Son: Thou camest forth from her chaste womb, but Thou didst not depart from her heart, Thou didst not cease to abide in her: now art Thou beneath her eyes, now art Thou the Object of all her pleasure; Thou didst permit her the honour of embracing Thee, of bestowing on Thee a thousand loving and holy kisses, of closely pressing Thee to her venerable bosom, which hath borne Thee, and wherein Thy Holy Flesh was formed; of nourishing Thee now with her own substance, giving Thee the food of her breast, on which depends Thy Life, O Thou Author of Life. Thou didst give her the enjoyment of Thy first tender love; GOD as Thou art, Thou didst owe this to her, for as she was Thy Mother, and Thou hadst not man for father, Thou didst derive from her alone Thy Body and Thy Blood.

She then, O my LORD, was, at the blessed moment of Thy Nativity, Thy first worshipper, as she is now, too, the first and most perfect of those who love Thee. She only, of the whole world, had a right to adore "That which was born of her." What in any other creature would have been an abominable idolatry, deserving the extremest punishment, is in her a rightful worship, and obtaineth for her everlasting crowns, because she was not the mother of man only, but also the Mother of GOD; *and in this glorious quality Thou wilt not admit the Angels of Heaven, or the kings of earth, until after her, to offer Thee, O Divine Saviour, their homage and their adorations.*

TEXT.

"And she brought forth her first-born Son." (Luke ii. 7.)

PARAPHRASE XI.

What honour and what a glorious distinction hast Thou bestowed upon Thy holy Mother, O blessed LORD, *in making of her own blood the rightful object of her adoration, the material, the instrument, and the Author of her own redemption*, in that she brought forth Thee, O JESUS, Who art her Son, her GOD, her Saviour! Thus did she ever have the consolation, both during the whole course of her life, and now during an endless eternity, of adoring the Fruit of her chaste womb, of having concurred in Its production as Its only source, so that no other mortal could partake with her in this privilege. *Thou didst redeem her by this same Blood, Which, before It flowed in Thy Veins*, O Adorable Son of GOD, *did first flow in hers.*

Her redemption was more glorious than that of other men; *in her it anticipated falling*, and *she had no sins to weep over*, whilst we can but offer to GOD a liberty whose beginning was soiled by sin. Such, O All-Holy Son of a holy and a Virgin Mother, was the glorious privilege which thou didst accord. But remember, O Blessed Jesus, that Thou, the Son of Man, deignest to call us brethren; that Thou hast redeemed Thy brethren by Thy Blood, and that I am one of them.. Yet will Thy Name, Thy mark, Thy Sacraments, avail us not, unless we imitate Thee; O let us not bear Thy Holy Name to our punishment; conform us, O LORD, to the holy poverty of Thy Manger, that we may be united to Thy true worshippers; choose for us, LORD, what, for love of us, Thou chosest for Thyself; destroy in us what Thou hatest, and love in us Thy likeness which Thou givest.

TEXT.

"And she brought forth her first-born Son." (Luke ii. 7.)

PARAPHRASE XII.

Adorable JESUS, I see Thy Mother in the stable prostrate at Thy Feet, at the moment that Thou wert born of her pure Womb, in posture the most humble, and as if the least and vilest of all creatures, albeit she was thy Mother: for thou art at once her GOD and her Son, and the adoration she offers Thee, although she was the most favoured of all creatures, teaches me what I owe Thee, my GOD and my Saviour. *Let her go still further, O Holy Child, let her wholly give herself up to sweet transports of joy and love: let her take Thee in her arms; let her, after adoring Thee, caress Thee with all the tenderness with which a mother's love can inspire her; let her closely press Thee, her Divine and beloved Child, upon her maternal bosom, and unite her lips to Thine by a multitude of holy kisses.*

She had more right to do this than the Spouse in the sacred Canticles, who yet had the boldness to ask this of her spouse; this was her privilege, whilst *we sinners* consider ourselves too much honoured if Thou suffer us to remain humbly prostrate at Thine Infant Feet; let her there take Thee, O Holy Child JESUS (as the daughter of Pharaoh said to the mother of the young Moses), and *nourish Thee up for me*, that so Thou mayest hereafter teach me those Divine Truths which will proceed out of Thy Mouth, in order to instruct me in the ways of Heaven, and to finish the great work of my redemption.

I hope it is needless to make any comment on such writing. It would be sad, indeed, to think that it could be read by many with any other feeling than disgust and horror. What would Dr. Pusey himself have said of such a document in 1841?

CHAPTER XVII.

MEDITATION—DR. PUSEY'S ADAPTATIONS—AVRILLON'S GUIDE FOR PASSING LENT HOLILY—THE DESIGN OF THESE ADAPTATIONS.

From what I have already laid before my reader it may be gathered, that Dr. Pusey entertains no serious objection to the system of meditation advocated by Mr. Oakeley. At least, any one who has read the extracts I have made from his adaptations of Avrillon will not think such a supposition uncharitable or unfair. However, in fact, there is no need of discussing this question, as Dr. Pusey has himself taken an opportunity, in one of his late publications, of defending the system.

The passage I refer to is in the preface to his adaptation of another work of Avrillon's:—

A Guide for passing Lent Holily, in which is found for each day, Advice as to Practice, a Meditation and Thoughts on the Gospel for the Day, and Passages from the Holy Scriptures and the Fathers; with a Collect, and one point in the Passion of our Lord Jesus Christ. By Avrillon. Translated from the French, and *adapted to the use of the English Church.*

In the preface to this volume, Dr. Pusey plainly avows his approval of the method of tampering with Holy Scripture, which is now recommended by this party under the name of Meditation;—and on precisely the same ground as Mr. Oakeley has taken.

But, before I quote what he says on this subject, it will be necessary to transcribe another passage, which occurs earlier in the preface. I have already observed, that Dr. Pusey avows that these books are not merely *translations*, but that he has *adapted* them to the use of the English church; and by the fact of his professing them to be *adaptations*, and still more by the *alterations* and *omissions* which he is continually acknowledging, he has obviously made himself responsible for their contents, in a way very different to what he would have done had he confined himself to a mere *translation*. Not that I mean by this, that he would have incurred *no* responsibility by editing mere translations, and sending them forth to the public with the sanction of his name. To select the works of foreign writers, and translate them with never so rigid a fidelity, and then publish them, in order that they may be read by the members of the church of England, and used as helps for their private devotions, could not be done without incurring a very serious responsibility indeed. And I am far from insinuating, that if Dr. Pusey had confined himself to this, and people had afterwards cited his translations, as proofs of the nature and tendency of the system he is endeavouring to propagate, he would have been so disingenuous as to say,—"I am not responsible for anything in these books; they are mere translations. I have done nothing more than edit them, and given my

name and recommendatory preface to the work."—In fact, no honest man would resort to such a defence. If he did select and translate them (or edit the translations) for such a purpose, the question is obvious—Why *did* he do so? What possible reason could he have for endeavouring to circulate them among the members of his own communion, except this, that he approved of them, and thought them likely to do no harm?—For, even if he thought them calculated to be *generally* useful, still, if he knew them to contain matter which he believed to be untrue or mischievous, or even injudicious and unsafe, any conscientious man would consider this a sufficient reason for abstaining from introducing them to the public; error being then most mischievous when mixed up with truth,—especially in highly imaginative and devotional works, where the excitement of the feelings must be so apt to put the reader off his guard, and prevent him from exercising a vigilant discrimination.

But, if any one were to resort to such an apology for Dr. Pusey as this, the answer would be,—that it is a misapprehension of the facts of the case; the books not being mere *translations*, or pretended to be such, but *adaptations*. This is avowed:—and in this process of adaptation Dr. Pusey has so completely made the works his own, by alterations and omissions, that, without having the originals before one, no person can conjecture how much of the author's

language, opinions, or even his authorities, have survived the process of *adaptation*.

Some persons may be disposed to question, whether it be fair to take such liberties with the writings of any man, especially since, after all this transmutation, the books still carry their authors' names upon the title page. But whether such treatment of the writings of the dead be fair or not, it surely is not an unreasonable question to ask—Why one should pitch on works which required so much alteration to make them safe? Why not write new ones? Why not reprint some of the devotional writings of our own divines? This I consider a question of real importance, because the answer will help to throw light on the character of the movement.

From what Dr. Pusey states in the preface to this Guide to Lent, regarding his object in making these adaptations, it would seem that *English* theology could furnish nothing suited to his purpose.

> The object of the following little work, and of any others of the like sort which it may be permitted to the Editor to publish, is to meet, as far as may be, some of the wants which the mighty stirring of minds within our church for some time past has created.—Guide to Lent, Pref. p. v.

Which is a plain acknowledgment, that the wants and cravings created by the movement he has been engaged in carrying on, are not to be supplied by the writings of the divines of the English church. Still, it may be asked, why not meet these wants by

compositions of his own, or of his friends? Are these new wants of such a nature as the Tracts for the Times, and the poetry and sermons of the tract writers and their associates, are inadequate to meet and satisfy? In a word, why resort to the writings of Roman catholics? Because, it appears, these new wants are such, as are not to be adequately supplied by the writers of a church which has not monastic orders and sacramental confession. So Dr. Pusey himself will inform us in this same Preface.

The Editor, then, wished to minister through others what he was not qualified to provide himself. Directions as to holy seasons, contemplations of our Lord, guidance in the habits of meditation and mental prayer, to self-knowledge, to penitence, the spiritual life, the bearing of His Cross and conformity to Him, holy performance of the ordinary actions of daily life, Divine love, enlarged and deeper views of the Christian graces, were objects on which he wished to furnish such assistance as he might, for those who hunger after it.

For both the large heads, under which these and the like wants would fall,—contemplation and self-discipline,—the spiritual writers of foreign Churches have, as yet, some obvious advantages over our own;—for the discipline and knowledge of self, through that knowledge of the human heart which results from habitual confession; for contemplation, in the Monastic Orders, as joining, in all cases, contemplation and mental prayer with charity and mortification.—Guide to Lent, Pref. pp. x. xi.

This being the case, Dr. Pusey has taken up the writings of Surin the Jesuit, Avrillon the Friar, and we are promised, in due time, the Spiritual Exercises of Ignatius Loyola. Still, dissatisfied

with *all* churches, even the writings of his new allies require to be subjected to the crucible of adaptation. To what extent, then, has Dr. Pusey gone in this process? Further on in this Preface he makes the following statement:—

With regard to doctrine, there was little in the present work which created any difficulty. A very few sentences only (as far as the Editor recollects) have been omitted or modified. And generally, in books of the Continental churches there are two distinct classes; some having so little of what is foreign, or would be painful to us, that one should hardly be aware that they were not written for our own people; others, in which what is distressing or would be strange to us meets us everywhere. Yet, *to mention, once for all, the plan pursued as to these works*, the Editor could not think it consistent with the commission he had received as a Pastor in this portion of the Lord's flock, to lay aside the office of guidance with which, however unworthy, he was, by the condescension of God, invested. He could not, as far as in him lay, *turn any of the little ones in the Church adrift* into a large pasture *to discriminate for themselves.* He has thought it his duty to *omit not only what he could not himself receive, but even some things which he could, which yet, he thought, would have been most naturally, from whatever cause, in us or in them, misconstrued. Such omissions it seemed inexpedient even to mark.* To insert them any how, was to raise the very questions which he wished to remove from the mind; to retain, but to guard them, would have been to turn books of practical religion into controversy. To what end to speak of the supremacy of Rome, when the question is of men's souls, of avoiding the snares of self-esteem and self-display, and living the hidden life with Christ in God? Controversy, as taking men off themselves and their own souls, has become a sore evil of the day. Without, it is, through the

overruling Providence of God, working what He wills; it were to aggravate the evils incident to it, to admit it into the province of the inward life.

These omissions, or even such few changes as have been ventured upon, in no way affect the general meaning of the Authors. Even in those few places in which it seemed desirable to modify a particular expression (and these have, as matter of honesty, been acknowledged,) still (it need scarcely be said) no expression has been introduced foreign to the tone of mind of the writer,—nothing which he might not acknowledge as his own. Indeed, the very words have, as nearly as possible, been retained. These changes seemed, then, to do the writers no injustice, even as they thought of these subjects while yet on earth. Rather, since it has been thought that departed saints receive an accession of bliss from the fruit of their labours, even after they have themselves rested from them, and since "there is joy in Heaven over one sinner that repenteth," and Holy Scripture says of our Blessed Lord himself, that "He saw of the travail of His soul and was satisfied," so one cannot but think that in that abode of love those blessed spirits must rejoice in benefiting those from whom, when on earth, they seemed estranged; and that, longing that He only, Whom they love, should be glorified, would joy in thus aiding to win souls, or to bring them closer to Him, the Lord of the One Church, to Whom all live.

The Editor felt no scruple then, in considering the state of our church alone, *in any adaptations which Christian wisdom or tenderness seemed to require.* The *works* thus adapted, cannot, it must be thought, promote sympathy with doctrines which do not occur in them.—Guide to Lent, Pref. pp. xiv.—xvii.

And as to any objection which might be made to his having selected *Roman-catholic* publications, he goes on to say:—

With regard to the other possible objection, an *undue* sympathy with the Churches from whom we are separated, any such sympathy as would lead persons to forget their duties to the Church wherein God in his mercy has placed them, and undervalue His exceeding mercies to them in her and through her, would indeed be very miserable. Yet such an abuse is to be corrected by other means, not by mere ignorance of God's gifts to other branches of the Church, or by the refusal to profit by those gifts when fitted to ourselves. On the contrary, since an especial grace is promised to the lowly, and love is the first-fruit of the Spirit, it must even be a benefit, if, as time goes on, any such publications should contribute *to a kindlier feeling towards those Churches* through whose members we have been benefited, or *a more instructed estimate* both of ourselves and of them. An increasing tone of humility is one of the most hopeful signs in God's dealings with our Church. So may one hope, that as we humble ourselves, He will exalt her to the office which, in the course of His Providence, He seems to have marked out for her.—Guide to Lent, Pref. pp. xvii., xviii.

From all which, it is plain, that Dr. Pusey expects and desires these books to produce in their readers' minds a higher opinion of the church of Rome, and a lower opinion of the church of England,—or what he would call "a more instructed estimate" of both. But, as to his own concurrence with the *doctrines* taught in these works, and particularly in the work immediately under notice, the Guide to passing Lent Holily, "there was *little*," he says, "which created any difficulty." And as to its present state, he has subjected his author to so severe a course of adaptation—in order to render the book precisely

what he thinks it desirable to provide for the present wants of the public—that he has pruned away from the original, "not only what he could not himself receive, but even some things which he could, which yet, he thought, would have been most naturally, from whatever cause, in us or in them, misconstrued."*

If, then, this book shall be found to contain statements which contradict the doctrine of the church of England, and to prescribe a pattern of devotion hostile to the tone and spirit of the English liturgy, —in effect, no matter what it shall be found to contain,—Dr. Pusey has here deliberately and distinctly made himself responsible for it all. Had there been anything in what he has published which he could not receive, he declares that he would have omitted it—he should have "thought his duty" to omit it—he should have considered it inconsistent with his commission as a Christian pastor to have retained it, or to have turned "any of the little ones in the church adrift into a large pasture to discriminate for themselves." Nay, he has omitted, "not only what he could not himself receive, but even some things which he could, which yet, he thought, would have been most naturally, from whatever cause, in us or in them, misconstrued." From which it plainly

* The whole of this passage can hardly fail to remind the reader of Mr. Oakeley's account of his mode of preparing Bonaventure's Life of Christ for the English public.

follows, that if some persons should feel scruples at anything he *has* retained, he must either consider such scruples as undeserving of much consideration, or else he imagines the church of England to be in such a state, that there are not many to whose minds such scruples are likely to occur.

What is taught in this work on Lent, will be plain, from the extracts I shall in the next chapter proceed to lay before the reader.

CHAPTER XVIII.

DR. PUSEY'S DEFENCE OF THE PRACTICE OF MEDITATION—HIS MEDITATION ON THE CRUCIFIXION—MR. OAKELEY'S MEDITATION ON THE SAME SUBJECT.

The first place is due to the theory of Meditation. As I have already observed, enough has been transcribed already, to show, that Dr. Pusey does not disapprove of what his party call *meditation*. If he had thought it sinful to make additions to the sacred text in order to render it more edifying, of course, he never would have published what I have extracted from his adaptation of Avrillon's work on Advent. But in his preface to this work on Lent, he undertakes to defend the principle,—and that precisely on the ground taken by Mr. Oakeley. The plan of the work includes Meditations on the Lord's Passion,—"one point" of which is made to form the subject of meditation each day during Lent. The liberties which these meditations take with the gospel narrative I hope to notice hereafter. But, from the preface, it is evident Dr. Pusey felt that some persons were not prepared to receive such a mode of treating the Holy Scriptures, and therefore he has thought it necessary to meet the objection in this manner—

In the very contemplation of those awful sufferings, there will probably be a difference between the mode in

which most recent foreign writers dwell upon them, and our own, arising, it is to be feared, *from our want of the habit of meditation.* The foreign writers dwell (sometimes, it seems, almost too exclusively) on the visible Sufferings of our Lord; the habit of most of us has probably been to think only of His bearing the wrath of the Father. Yet both have been made known to us; and the very fulness of the Gospels in dwelling upon those Sufferings, is a plain indication to us *how we ought to meditate upon them. Even where circumstances are not actually told, since, if we think of them at all, we must think of them as taking place in some way, we cannot help, in our own minds, supplying them;* and *we may accept thankfully any suggestions which enable us to supply them reverently.* Thus, where it is said, in this little book, (p. 280,) that our Blessed Lord stretched out His Right Hand graciously, when laid upon the Cross, it seems *scarcely an addition* to Holy Scripture; it harmonizes with it and His Divine Meekness. So, again, with regard to what is so much dwelt upon, the Effusion of His Sacred Blood; it is involved in what Holy Scripture tells us. The disfiguring of His Form is the most literal fulfilment of the prophecy of Isaiah. (Ch. liii.) On the other hand, we must be careful, while dwelling upon his Bodily Sufferings, to keep in mind those which we can still less understand, and which foreign writers seem sometimes on the verge of passing over. Thus the present writer, in speaking of the words, "I thirst," although he quotes the prophecy of which these words were the fulfilment, almost seems, in his wish to set those Sufferings before us, to forget that the words were said in order to fulfil that prophecy—to represent them as too much direct and natural results of those Sufferings. There seems a risk, in a word, *lest such representations become too human.* But our tendency *is all the other way;* and this is said, as well that we may not take offence at what we have not, as that we may not part with what we have.—Guide to Lent, Preface, xlii., xliii.

Here then is Mr. Oakeley's principle distinctly avowed—

Even where circumstances are not actually told, since, if we think of them at all, we must think of them as taking place in some way, we cannot help, in our own minds, supplying them; and *we may accept thankfully any suggestions which enable us to supply them reverently.*

"If we think of them all."—But why should we think of them? Why should we not resist such thoughts, if they do, at any time, force themselves on the imagination? Is it not as much our duty to expel them on the instant, as to resist any other temptation? And why should we not draw back our foot, whenever the silence of inspiration warns us to beware of intruding into what the Almighty has seen fit to conceal? But really I cannot help asking,—what notion can men have of *reverence* who talk of *reverently supplying* what common sense tells them may be totally false, and what, if it be true, the wisdom and goodness of the Author of Revelation has thought it expedient for them to be ignorant of? There is no reverence in such feelings. It is a miserable delusion. Reverence would as certainly keep men from presuming to take such liberties with the Holy Scriptures, as honesty and the fear of God will keep any one who has much of either, from feeling any wish to trifle with truth on any subject, or any pleasure in falsifying historical documents of any sort. According to Dr. Pusey, to say, "that our blessed Lord stretched out His Right

Hand graciously, when laid upon the Cross," seems *scarcely an addition* to Holy Scripture." But, what confusion of a very plain question! It *is* an addition to Holy Scripture—or it is not. If it be, why not say at once,—"I think myself at liberty to make additions to Holy Scripture, whenever I imagine that my doing so will render the volume more edifying and better fitted to meet the wants of the human soul,"—instead of endeavouring to evade the guilt of such an act of daring irreverence by calling it "scarcely an addition"? It *is* an addition. An addition, for which a shadow of warrant is not even pretended. And if people are at liberty to make such additions, *they were always so.* And then, what becomes of the certainty of the gospel history? Who can tell how far the evangelical narrative may have been tampered with—to what extent circumstances may have been altered, omitted, or "reverently supplied" by former meditators—and, consequently, how much of it can be relied on, as a trustworthy record of the facts which actually took place, and the words actually spoken? There is danger, indeed, "lest such representations become too human,"—lest men learn to turn the gospel into a romance, a poem, or a tragedy, and deceive themselves by their endeavours to "*compassionate*" the sufferings of Christ,—as if the Son of God were a creation of poetic fancy,—and wail and lament, and take all this for piety. But an infinitely greater

danger lies at the root of this; namely, that truth is trifled with;—since without truth, religion is nothing better than a mischievous deception, where sentimental excitement is substituted for holiness, and integrity, and the fear of God.

But let us turn to the passage in this "Guide to Passing Lent Holily," to which Dr. Pusey refers, and see what sort of "suggestions" these are, which he tells us we should "thankfully accept." The passage occurs in the thirty-sixth point in the Passion—"Jesus transfixed to the cross." Dr. Pusey refers to the third paragraph: but it is better to transcribe the preceding matter, as a specimen of what is now called reverence.

THIRTY-SIXTH POINT IN THE PASSION.

JESUS TRANSFIXED TO THE CROSS.

No sooner was the Lord despoiled of His garments, than *they threw Him upon the Cross which was prepared and lying on the earth.* It was not difficult to cause that fainting and exhausted Body to fall. *Besides*, this Divine Saviour, Who burnt with love to mankind, and consequently for the Cross, which was to be the instrument of their salvation, allowed Himself to be stretched voluntarily and without resistance upon this Cross, which He Himself was so ardently desiring, and *which He regarded as the nuptial bed on which He was going to espouse the whole Church in general*, and in particular *all those faithful souls, whom He must ever cherish as His spouse.*

But O my GOD, what a nuptial bed was this, for a Spouse so beautiful, so noble, so majestic, and so holy! What rigour, what hardness! what courage in suffering for love of us, and what a condemnation for our softness

and for our cowardice! Ah, Lord! this is not a bed of delight, and covered with flowers, as Thou didst deserve, and as the spouse of the sacred Canticles described it, but a bed of sorrows and a bed of cruelty, because Thou wouldest be a Husband of Blood, and teach us that the paths which lead to Heaven are blood-sprinkled.

Laid upon the Cross, He extends His Right Hand with goodness, and gives It to the torturer who was to pierce It: All-Powerful Hand, Which could have overthrown and destroyed all His adversaries; kind and Divine Hand, upon Which they ought much rather to have imprinted a thousand respectful kisses, as signs of their worship, and to draw upon themselves His graces and His blessings! The torturer inhumanly takes that Sacred Hand, and pierces It cruelly with many blows; he causes the Flesh, together with the nail, to enter the wood of the Cross. They snatch His other Hand, they drag It with violence to make It reach the prepared hole, and thus cause Him a cruel and painful tension; at length they pierce It, and transfix It as the other.

It is thus, dear Lord, that Thou didst suffer them to treat Thy Hands, those workers of so many miracles.—Guide to Lent, pp. 279, 280.

And this, Dr. Pusey says, "seems scarcely an addition to Holy Scripture. It is shocking to be obliged to transcribe such writing, much more to be forced to make any comment on it. The subject is so awful—the feelings excited by seeing it made a plaything for an unbridled imagination are so inadequately represented by any words—that I would rather be silent, and leave my reader to his own reflections. But I must beg him to observe, that it is here distinctly stated,—not as Bonaventure would say—"we may piously imagine,"—but as

matter of historical fact—1st, that the Lord was thrown down upon the cross, which was lying on the earth; 2ndly, that the Lord allowed himself to be thrown down in this manner *because* he "regarded" the cross "as the nuptial bed on which he was going to espouse the whole church in general, and in particular all those faithful souls, whom He must ever cherish as his spouse;" and, 3rdly, that the Lord extended "His Right Hand with goodness," and gave "It to the torturer who was to pierce It,"—or, as Dr. Pusey says in his preface, "stretched out His Right Hand graciously:" in other words, that, (1), the *right* hand was nailed to the cross before the *left;* and, (2), that it was given *voluntarily* by the Lord to his torturer for that purpose, and not forcibly laid hold of. And these statements are not only made, as a record of facts which actually happened; but from history Dr. Pusey turns to prayer, and says, "*It is thus,* dear Lord, that *Thou didst suffer them to treat Thy Hands.*" Now, Dr. Pusey knows perfectly well, that what he is thus, in an address to the Almighty, assuming to have taken place, may never have taken place at all; that the *left* hand may have been nailed before the *right,* and that neither of them may have been given spontaneously, but both seized by violence. He knows this: he acknowledges that he knows and recollects it: for, in saying, "it seems *scarcely* an addition," he does plainly confess that he

is conscious of what he is doing. How any Christian could, with such consciousness and recollection, address his Redeemer in such language as implies an absolute certainty of the truth of the statements on which he founds his prayer, is inexplicable. But this, Dr. Pusey will tell us, "seems scarcely an addition to Holy Scripture; it harmonizes with it and His divine meekness." Indeed! But, suppose some other meditator should think it will *harmonize* better with both, to represent the facts to have happened in a directly contrary manner, has he not as good a right to alter the sacred history as Dr. Pusey has? The following, for example, is the way in which Mr. Oakeley chooses to represent the transaction, in his "Meditation on the Passion of our Lord for the sixth hour."

In this place, observe carefully the method of crucifixion. Two ladders are placed behind, one at the right hand, the other at the left; wicked men mount these with nails and hammers, while another ladder is placed in front, reaching to the part on which the feet were to be fixed. Observe, then, well each particular: *our Lord Jesus is compelled to ascend the cross by this small ladder* (whatever they will, He does meekly, without remonstrance or contradiction); and when He had come to the cross at the top of this small ladder, He turns His face round, and expanding His Royal arms, raises them up, and offers them to those who crucify Him. He looks up to heaven, and says to His Father, "Lo, here am I, My Father. Thou hast willed that I should be brought low, even to the death of the cross, for the love and salvation of mankind: it is My pleasure—I am content to do it; I offer Myself for those whom Thou hast

given Me, whom Thou hast willed to be My brethren. O Father, accept My offering; henceforward be propitious from love of Me; wipe away from them all former stains, and set them far from them. Father, I offer Myself to Thee for them." Then he who is behind the cross takes His right hand, and nails it down strongly to the cross; which done, he on the left side takes His left hand, draws it out as far as he can, puts in another nail, strikes it down and fixes it in. Then they come down from the ladders, which are all taken away, and the Lord hangs down by the weight of His Body, drawing Him downwards, supported only by nails through His hands. Nevertheless, another comes up and draws Him down by the feet as far as possible, and, while He is thus drawn down, yet another transfixes His feet with a most cruel nail.

Some there are, however, who think that this was not the method of crucifixion, but that, laying the cross along the ground, they placed Him upon it, then raised the cross, and fixed it in the ground. *If you incline to this*, behold how they seize him contemptuously, as though the meanest ruffian, and with mad fury throw Him down upon the cross, *taking His arms and fixing them most cruelly upon it, having first drawn them with violence in opposite directions.* In like manner, behold what was done to His feet, which they drew down with the greatest possible violence.—Life of Christ, pp. 222—224.

So that, according to Mr. Oakeley and Bonaventure, the cross was first raised and fixed in the ground, and the Lord compelled to ascend it by a small ladder; but "if you incline to" another supposition, then you may say that it was not erected first, but that while it lay on the ground the Lord was nailed to it; so far agreeing with Dr. Pusey, but differing from him in stating that vio-

lence *was* used in taking and fastening his hands. "If you incline to this."—"It seemed scarcely an addition."—And is it come to this, that clergymen of the church of England are endeavouring to teach mankind to regard the sufferings and sacrifice of the Son of God, with as little reverence as a novelist or dramatic poet would show to the facts of history?—just as if it was allowable to dress up, and alter, and invent, in describing the particulars of that awful mystery, as "you incline," or as you think may excite the compassionate feelings of the reader. If it be meant that it is lawful and innocent to treat this subject with as little ceremony as Shakspeare has shown to English History—if it be meant, that it is lawful to treat the gospel as a foundation for historical romance and tragedy—let it be said so, and that plainly. But, unquestionably, if this be not what is meant, by saying,—"where circumstances are not actually told, we cannot help, in our own minds, supplying them; and we may accept thankfully any suggestions which enable us to supply them reverently"—"Why may I not please to imagine?"—"What great harm though I be mistaken?"—if it be not meant by such language, to teach men that they have a right to take such liberties with the inspired writings, it very much becomes those who use it, to say what they really do mean.

CHAPTER XIX.

VARIOUS EXAMPLES OF THE LIBERTY DR. PUSEY TAKES WITH HOLY SCRIPTURE—THE AGONY OF CHRIST—THE SLEEP OF THE APOSTLES—CHRIST BEFORE ANNAS AND CAIAPHAS—THE SCOURGING OF CHRIST.

HAD I not patiently toiled through this Guide to Lent, (and no trifling exercise of Christian patience it was,) I should have thought the licence which Dr. Pusey allows himself in colouring the sacred narrative perfectly incredible. Words and circumstances are introduced as matters of fact, for which there is not the slightest foundation.

"He riseth from supper, and took a towel and girded Himself; after that He poureth water into a bason, and began to wash the disciples' feet, and to wipe them." Peter, confused by so humiliating an action in One whom he had already acknowledged to be the "Son of the living God," and not yet enough enlightened to enter into the designs of His adorable Master, and knowing not that humility and charity *sometimes cause superiors to fall at the feet of their inferiors*, desired to oppose it; he thought even he ought to make some resistance. Then JESUS commanded; and *proceeded even to threats*. Peter was obliged to yield, and he suffered, through obedience, that his Master, his Saviour, and his GOD, should be at his feet.

What an unheard of sight! what a miraculous humility! what a surprising marvel! An All-powerful GOD, the King of Heaven and earth, *kneeling* at the feet of His servants, His disciples, and His subjects, in the attitude of a

servant, and His Apostles seated as if His masters!—Guide to Lent, pp. 25, 26.

Where did Dr. Pusey learn that the Lord was "kneeling?"

Again, in the meditation on the treachery of Judas, he ascribes his conduct to revenge.

Thus disappointed of a sum of three hundred pence, which he would have appropriated to himself, and with which he hoped to swell his unjustly-gotten treasure, *he now wished to revenge his frustrated avarice*, and indemnify it in part, *by selling* not a precious balm, but *the Person of* JESUS CHRIST *Himself*.—Guide to Lent, p. 41.

Again, in the account of the Lord's agony, he asserts that His prayer was not heard, in the very face of the statement in the epistle to the Hebrews.

It is not so with JESUS, because *He prays without being heard;* and although He begins His prayer three different times, although He prays with all possible reverence, all imaginable submission and fervour, and although His prayer is accompanied by sighs, and groans, and tears, He finds in it ever new agonies, since *He is not heard favourably*.—Guide to Lent, p. 64.

Further on in this same meditation he says—

Contemplate this humble Saviour, in the posture of a suppliant and a criminal, on His Knees, bowed even to the earth, because He is oppressed with the burden of our sins, *sometimes falling through weakness and fainting, sometimes making fruitless efforts to raise Himself;* His Eyes bathed in tears, now cast down by submission to GOD His Father, and now raised to Heaven to ask the help which He received not. *So many tears flow from His Eyes, that His whole Face, His garments, the "earth even are watered;"* His Mouth pronounces only trembling words, and those

interrupted with pitiable sobs; His Heart does but send forth the saddest, deepest sighs, which would seem able to melt the stones and to soften the most hard and insensible hearts, and with which His Heavenly Father only seemed not moved, because it was needful for Him to die, and the sentence of His death is pronounced.—Guide to Lent, pp. 65, 66.

Where of course it is needless to say, that the statements here marked in italics are pure inventions.

In like manner, in the meditation on the sleep of the Apostles—

EIGHTH POINT IN THE PASSION.

THE SLEEP OF THE APOSTLE.

JESUS, after having long prayed before His Heavenly Father, *fatigued by the constrained* posture in which He had been, and with the interior conflicts He had sustained, arose; and, like a man ready to die, who seeks some new situation to procure for himself some ease in his pain, but which he finds not, He went to find His disciples, who had fallen asleep whilst their Master was suffering the most cruel of all imaginable Agonies. This was without doubt an increase of grief for this suffering GOD; and this sloth was not pardonable in Apostles destined to vanquish tyrants, witnesses of His acts and of His miracles; and who had just before been making Him such high sounding protestations of courage and fidelity. They *knew* in what extremity of peril their Divine Master was, Who had forewarned them of it only a few hours before; *they knew that the traitor Judas, who had just parted company with them, was gone to the high priests*, His most cruel enemies, in order to deliver Him up to them; they knew that nothing less was pending than the death of Him Whom they had already acknowledged to be the Son of GOD. Besides

this, they saw Him prostrate on the earth, they perceived His extreme sadness and the hard conflicts He was sustaining; they heard the complaints, the sighs, the groans, which His heart, agonized with sorrow, raised towards heaven; they had but this last occasion in which they could show Him their love; *they knew also that it was for them, as well as for all mankind, that He was going to suffer and to shed His blood:* nevertheless, they are sleeping instead of praying, instead of watching, instead of preparing to defend at the peril of their lives Him Who was going to give His life for their sakes.

Jesus was affected at it, it was an addition of grief for Him. He rises from His prayer, He comes to them, and He makes them the reproach which they deserved for so shameful a sloth. "What!" says He kindly, "could ye not watch with me one hour?" Can a traitor subdue his desire of sleep in order to take Me, and do ye allow yourselves to be overcome by drowsiness, without putting any violence upon yourselves, *'although ye know the extreme danger I am in!*—Guide to Lent, pp. 71, 72.

Did the Lord say these words? Did the Apostles know that Judas was gone to the high priests? Did they know that the Lord was going to suffer and shed His blood for all mankind? Is it not certain from the gospel narrative, that—however distinctly the Lord had spoken to them—they did not understand the object of His death, even after He had suffered, much less before it;—in fact, not until after His resurrection, when He himself had to open their understandings, that they might understand the Scriptures?

Further on Dr. Pusey tells his readers, that the angel that appeared to strengthen the Lord brought

Him "a blood-stained cross and a cup filled with bitterness," (p. 81.)

It would be impossible to find room for every example this volume would supply of this sort of writing, but some passages are too important to be passed over without notice. In the following extract Dr. Pusey states, that it was when standing before Annas the Lord was struck, although it is certain this took place after He had been sent to Caiaphas.

SEVENTEENTH POINT IN THE PASSION.

JESUS STRUCK ON THE FACE.

JESUS being before the judgment-seat of Annas, and having replied to him upon His doctrine with singular modesty, His answer drew upon Him the extremest of all insults from a minister of the cruelty of this detestable judge, who, without respecting that Adorable Face before Which the Angels tremble, and Which they even dare not look at through respect, and that Divine Mouth from whence have proceeded only the words and the oracles of life, smote Him so insolently and so rudely on the Face that JESUS *fell to the ground, says St. Vincent Ferrier, and sprinkled the earth with much Blood*, which the violence of the blow caused to issue from his Adorable Mouth; so that *His Divine Cheek, bruised by this parricidal hand, kept its cruel mark, and thus remained disfigured even till after death.*—Guide to Lent, p. 143.

Surely if it were right to take such liberties with any history—still more with this awful mystery—one might have thought, that such additions as these are not needed to make a more useful impression, on any mind capable of receiving a useful impression

from them. But such admixtures of truth and falsehood have the most injurious tendency, even in the most devout mind. Nor is it possible to protect the truth from suffering by the contamination. It takes some time for the mind to recover the shock it receives, from seeing facts which it has never thought of without awe and trembling, disfigured by the meretricious daubing of a vulgar taste, insensible to the profoundly affecting majesty of the simplicity and brevity of the inspired narrative. It is only after we have forgotten these fictions, that we can return with our wonted reverence and composure to meditate, as God would have us meditate, on truth unsoiled by the polluting touch of falsehood. And this alone urges one on in this painful inquiry. It is for life we are contending. These men are poisoning the bread of life, and the water of life. To be silent in such a cause is treason against our own souls.

I know not how any one can read the writings of this school of Meditation, without the most distressing feelings of apprehension regarding the spiritual state to which their authors and admirers have reduced themselves. Beginning with mystical and spiritual explanations of Scripture, and slight verbal alterations of that word, which they ought (if they believe it to be the word of the living God) to tremble at,—they seem to have brought their minds to that condition, that the simple statements of the holy

Evangelists fail any longer to make any impression on them. They seem to write under a consciousness, that they need stronger stimulants *now*, and that without the additions and exaggerations of a licentious fancy, the letter of the sacred text would fall cold and spiritless on an unaffected heart. To what else can we attribute such treatment as this, of particulars which a devout mind can never allude to without horror and humiliation? To dwell upon them is unnatural. To a man educated as Dr. Pusey has been, I should have thought it would have been absolutely impossible. But, perhaps it is confusing the question to consider education to be any preservative against such depravity of taste. It is but justice to Bonaventure to say that (with the exception of the introduction of the name of Annas) his treatment of the following point is almost in the language of Scripture. This is Mr. Oakeley's version:—

> And now at length, when He is brought before the chief priests, Annas and Caiaphas, and the other elders assembled with them, they rejoice as a lion when the prey is taken, they interrogate Him, they suborn false witnesses, they condemn Him, spit on His most sacred Face, blindfold and buffet Him, smite Him with the palms of their hands, saying, "*Prophesy who is it that smote Thee?*" —Life of Christ, p. 215.

Compare this with Dr. Pusey's meditation, which is as follows:—

TWENTIETH POINT IN THE PASSION.

JESUS ABUSED AT THE HOUSE OF CAIAPHAS.

Scarcely had Caiaphas pronounced that JESUS is worthy of death, than the only question was, who should insult Him with most insolence; dreadful language, insupportable mockeries, cutting railleries, furious passions, execrable blasphemies, all are applauded there, and all pass for zeal for religion; and as if their effrontery and their fury against their Saviour and against their GOD was a merit in them, and as if there were a prize destined for him who should do Him the most bitter outrages, there was a cursed emulation in ill-treating Him, and in boldly heaping upon Him new insults.

They began these wicked treatments by spitting on His Face, without respecting that Adorable Face before Which the Angels tremble with fear and awe. These monsters, whose unworthy lips were so many sinks of horrors and impurities, *poured a thousand infected soils upon His Head, His Cheeks, His Eyes, His Mouth, and His whole Person.*

How afflicting a spectacle! to see JESUS alone, in the midst of these soldiers and ministers of the cruelty of a hateful judge, keeping silence, pierced with sorrow, *covered with* filth, and suffering all for the love of us! But what ignominy, O my GOD! Thou Who didst formerly use Thy "Spittle" for enlightening the eyes of the blind; and these blinded ones use theirs *to darken and defile Thine*, wherein shines all the Divine Majesty. Couldest Thou not turn that Adorable Face away, to protect It from that shame and spitting? But couldest Thou not confound and overwhelm these impious and sacrilegious men? Thou couldst, O my dear Lord, but Thou willest to be a Man of Sorrows, altogether given up to grief. Thou wouldest not hide Thy whole Face from this bitter

affront for love of me. Thou wouldest not turn It away, as Thou hadst said by one of Thy prophets; "I hid not My Face from shame and spitting." (Isa. l. 6.)

Others more cruel, "plucked off the hair" from His Cheek; and all conspiring to smite Him and to disfigure Him, made Him the most pitiable of all objects of pity. Yea, not content with having veiled and disfigured the beauty of His Countenance by the bruises, and the buffets, and the shameful defilements wherewith they had covered It, they devised to blindfold Him that He might divine "who it was that smote" Him, thus making Him their puppet and the object of their cruel mockings, turning into ridicule His Divine Knowledge, which deserved the respect and adoration of the whole world.

Perhaps, too, they put a veil over His Face, that they might smite Him with the more hardihood, and so as to be no longer moved to compassion by the sight of an object which was capable of inspiring the most savage heart with pity: thus hiding from themselves, by a cruel and horrible device, all which might have been able to soften them. The Majesty of His Forehead, the Divine glance of His Eye, His Mouth already livid and bruised with blows, His whole Visage covered with Blood, might perhaps have touched them; *they hide them then from their own eyes, that they may give more liberty to their murderous hands to strike Him, and to perpetrate new outrages against Him.*—Guide to Lent, pp. 166—168.

Such writing, if it be the result of a set purpose and design, *as this avowedly is,* can be considered no otherwise than an acknowledgment on the author's part, that the Word of God, as God has given it, is no longer able to satisfy the cravings of his mind. And whether, in such a case, silence and self-examination would not be more becoming the responsi-

bilities of a Christian minister, than these unceasing efforts to bring others to a similar condition, is a question which I should be thankful indeed to see considered with the seriousness it deserves.

A similar reflection is forced on my mind by the following, which is found in the Meditation on the Scourging of Christ.

Jesus Christ is given into the hands of the executioners, who began by stripping Him of His garments, and discovering to the eyes of an insolent multitude that Virginal Body, formed by the Hands of the Holy Spirit of God, and then *bound him to a pillar*, to begin the cruel Act of His Scourging. Oh be present in spirit at this bloody execution! Think of, see, feel for, refuse not some few tears and some few sobs for This God Who suffers, because He loves thee. See, a *number of executioners are occupied with searching for scourges, for chains, and rods of iron*, and now come with rage to strike His innocent Body. *These redoubled blows sound horribly, dolefully, sufficient to make the most barbarous shudder with horror; the whole hall echoes;* and those who looked on, far from being touched with compassion, find in it a cruel enjoyment.

As *the whole Body of* Jesus *was tightly bound with cords, which served as ligatures to His veins, His Adorable Blood followed each stroke* they inflicted on Him; so *that the executioners and spectators were sprinkled therewith*, but alas! without being melted by it. *The pillar has lost its own colour;* it is all stained by the Blood of Jesus. [Mr. Oakeley says the pillar "still shews the marks of blood, as is related in some accounts," (p. 217.) Of course, the Evangelists have said nothing of any pillar.] *The pavement is inundated;* the *Feet of the Saviour no longer rest but in His own Blood. The executioners and their helpers*

walk over It, and trample It under their feet. Oh hateful profanation! This Adorable Body is all torn; they strike no longer on Him, but upon wounds—Super dolorem vulnerum meorum addiderunt. They break His Flesh: and *if that hall had been searched, morsels of His Flesh would have been found together with His Blood*, torn and dragged off by the exceeding violence of the blows.—Ibid., pp. 223, 224.

Who can read such writing without wishing, that Dr. Pusey would exercise his imagination on some other subject than the Word of God! And this feeling is not likely to be diminished by the following:—

Jesus, all His strength exhausted by a Scourging so long and so severe, all covered with Bruises, with Wounds, and with Blood, even from the Head to the Feet, was at length unbound from the pillar, when the executioners were weary and tired of striking Him. But the extreme Pains he had endured in this bloody execution, and *the prodigious quantity of Blood which He had lost*, had so extremely enfeebled Him, and made Him so unable to sustain Himself upright, that *when He was no longer held up by the cords to the pillar, He fell to the ground amid His Own Blood; and there would He have died of weakness, exhaustion, and pain, had they not raised Him up.*

O incomprehensible situation for an All-mighty God! O sad and doleful sight, enough to melt the very rocks! cries St. Augustine. Proh dolor! jacet extensus ante hominem Deus! Lying extended before men on the ground, in His own Blood, with a livid Body, bruised and marred, is God, in the presence of men, His own creatures, and who look upon Him in this dreadful posture, with a cruel, savage, and inhuman pleasure, a posture in which perhaps was never seen even the most wicked of men! *A God who gathers with pain and as He can His scattered garments to cover Him, and Who is so weak that*

He needs the help of one of His tormentors to aid Him in rising. . . . . .—Ibid., pp. 230, 231.

After having treated His Body with so great cruelty, in this Scourging, they would that His Head, worthy as It is of all respect, and to wear all the crowns of heaven and earth, should also suffer some new torment which till then had been unknown. They cruelly force upon Him a Crown of Thorns, whose sharp points *pierce even to the skull*, causing Him an exceeding pain, and *made a wondrous quantity of Blood to flow from Him. His Forehead, His Eyes, His Cheeks, His Mouth, were filled with It, and His Hair was so embrued, that, lying close upon His Head and Face, it disfigured them in a most pitiable and most grievous manner.*—Ibid., p. 232.

Is this true? If it be not, can it be edifying? True or false, what valuable effect is it calculated to produce on the mind, which the simple narrative of the Evangelists is inadequate to produce? In truth, this is one of the worst features in this school of meditation. It does really and in effect, teach men to regard the text of the sacred history as a dry and unedifying record. That which, according to this school, is *really* edifying, is the picture created by the fancy of the meditator. It is not the *fact*, but the *fiction*, which it regards as the means of sanctification. But to express my own feeling distinctly, I do not believe, that any one is ever edified by these fictions. And if the facts, as stated by the Evangelists, do not produce the feelings they are calculated to produce, my conviction is, that the feelings produced by the fictions created by the imagination, are a very mischievous self-deception.

CHAPTER XX.

MORE EXAMPLES—ECCE HOMO—CHRIST BEARING HIS CROSS —THE CROWN OF THORNS.

THE reader will probably remember, that Dr. Pusey has stated, in his preface, that the disfiguring of the Lord's form is one of the points where these meditations afford only such suggestions as should be thankfully accepted, as enabling us to supply reverently those circumstances which are not actually told. He says—"The disfiguring of his form is the most literal fulfilment of the prophecy of Isaiah." (Ch. liii.) The reference is to words that need no comment or paraphrase, to enable them to awaken the feelings which they ought to excite in the heart of a Christian. The reader shall now see, what it is that Dr. Pusey thinks can be justified in this manner. It seems to be the following, which occurs in the Meditation on "Jesus brought out before the people":—

Ecce Homo: Behold the Man! Know ye Him in the state in which He is? Ah! *it needed to say He was a man; for without that they would not have known Him to be one, since He had lost even its appearance.* The outrages of His Scourging, the Blood which flows from His Head since His Crowning with Thorns, have wholly changed His form. Couldest thou thyself even recognize a friend in such a pitiable state? His torn Skin, His broken Flesh, His opened veins, His whole body bruised

and bloody, have most cruelly marred Him. *Is it then the body of some evil one escaped from the torture, and destined to the last punishments;* or that of the "fairest of the children of men," of the All-Powerful God?—Ibid., pp. 239, 240.

Does any one seriously believe, that this is what Pilate meant by saying—"Behold the man!"—and can religion be promoted by such exaggerations as these? But it is useless to ask the question. Those who think it lawful to trifle with truth, are likely enough to persuade themselves that it is expedient. As to the last sentence in this paragraph, I cannot trust myself to take any further notice of it. And yet these are the persons who have for years been talking as if all reverential feelings in the *English* church were confined to their own party.

Another point to which Dr. Pusey refers in his preface is this, that in these meditations it is constantly stated (as, for example, in the foregoing extracts) that, during the sufferings which the Lord endured *before* he was crucified, almost the whole of his blood was shed. What the object of such a fiction can be, it is useless to inquire. But it is so very gross, and so startling to any one who has read the New Testament, that Dr. Pusey thinks it necessary to palliate it in his preface, by saying—"With regard to what is so much dwelt upon, the effusion of His sacred blood, it is involved in what Holy Scripture tells us." *Where* Holy Scripture has done so, or has given any countenance to the state-

ments Dr. Pusey puts forth in this book, he does not say. Most persons will feel, that the nature of the subject demanded a more distinct reference. The following is, no doubt, one of the passages to which Dr. Pusey alludes :—

All move, all march towards Calvary, to immolate this innocent Victim, and *to complete the shedding of that little Blood which yet rested in His Veins, which yet feebly sustained some few painful moments of that languishing life*, which will not long resist the horrible pains prepared for Him.

Contemplate the sad array of this Man of Sorrows ; see in spirit that pale and exhausted Saviour, coming forth from the house of Pilate, pushed, and dragged through the midst of the most frequented streets of Jerusalem, where but a few days before He had passed in triumph and was adored as the Messiah. In His train He was now accompanied by soldiers, by executioners, and by a numberless throng, who insult Him and look upon Him as the vilest of men. His Hands are bound with cords whose only colour now is that of blood ; His crown of thorns is upon His Head, and from it flows *so wondrous a fount of Blood that scarcely can His Face be seen.* His heavy and dying Eyes cast but languid looks, wherein the deepest sorrow is expressed. The abundant tears He sheds are mingled and confounded with the Blood which flows from His Head. His Divine Cheeks are swelled with buffets, bruised with blows, and half washed by the Tears which trickle from His Eyes. His Mouth is livid and bloody, and *He opens it only to allow His Lips to utter some sigh or groan* which the excess of His sadness and of His sorrow tears from His Heart. His Shoulders are mangled with scourging, and laden with the heavy burden of the Cross. His Feet are still all red with the Blood which He shed during His cruel Stripes ; and His whole Body

is so feeble that scarcely can he sustain it, *exhausted as it is by the wondrous quantity of Blood which He has shed.*

Let us then follow this suffering God to Calvary. *The ground covered with His Blood shall teach us the road thither; His Feet, whose form is imprinted in red, shall show us the path. His traces of Blood are too well marked for us not to perceive them.* Let us then follow in heart and mind the traces of this Man of Sorrows, and let us die with Him, since He goes to die for us; this death will give us life.—Ibid., pp. 256, 257.

Thus also, in the meditation on the words, "He gave up the Ghost"—

His Arteries were without Blood, there was no longer enough to sustain His languishing Life; He had lost too much during the sorrowful course of His Passion; already had He sprinkled with It, the Garden of Olives, the Pretorium, the streets of Jerusalem, and Calvary; and His Cross was imbued and penetrated with it.—Guide to Lent, p. 368.

The same idea is also contained in the following:—

JESUS CARRYING HIS CROSS.

When coming out of Pilate's house, they presented to Jesus the Cross to which he was to be transfixed: they cruelly laid this shameful and sorrowful burden upon Him, although His weakness was extreme, *from losing so lately so great a portion of His Blood.* The Saviour looked upon it with Eyes in which were marked both sorrow and resignation. He accepted it, in order to obey the Justice of God His Father, and for the love which He had for sinners. He took it then upon His Shoulders without hesitation, and the weightiness of this wood *caused His raiment to enter into His already torn Flesh.* . . . . —Ibid., p. 263.

Consider attentively this Man of Sorrows, *Who falls*

through faintness under the exceeding weight of the Cross, and *Who would indeed have died under this heavy burden*, if the Jews, who thirsted to cause His Death by a still more cruel and more shameful end, and to exercise their barbarous fury still longer upon His innocent Body, had not laid hold on a passer-by to lighten His burden.—Ibid., p. 264.

It is quite necessary to compare with this the account given by Mr. Oakeley in his translation of Bonaventure.

When He has resumed His clothes, they lead Him out, that they may no longer defer His death; and they place upon His shoulders THE ADORABLE WOOD OF THE CROSS,[1] long, thick, very heavy; and the most meek Lamb receives it with patience and bears it. (There is a current opinion that the Lord's cross was fifteen feet in height.) [*sic.*] Then He is dragged and hurried along, filled full of revilings, as was done at the first in the morning hour. He is dragged along with His two companions, even two thieves; lo, this is His company! O merciful Jesus, what shame do these, Thy two friends, cause Thee! They join Thee with thieves; nay, they do more to Thee than to them, for they load Thee with Thine own cross; which we read not of them; so that not only, as says Isaiah, *He was numbered with the transgressors*, He was reckoned more a transgressor than they. Unspeakable, O Lord, is Thy patience!

At this point then behold Him well, how He moves on, bent down with the weight of His cross, and how grievously He pants for breath; sorrow with Him as much as

[1] What can Mr. Oakeley mean by such language? Does he wish it to be believed that the wood was adorable even *before* the Lord suffered on it? No such expression is found in the Roman-catholic Translation of Bonaventure, which has merely, "the heavy wood of the cross."

you may, brought into so great a strait, enduring such repeated insults. And for that His Mother, truly sorrowing, for the multitude of the people could not come nigh to Him, nor see Him, *she went with John and the women, her companions, by a shorter way*, that, being before the rest, she might approach Him; but when, on meeting Him where the roads joined, without the gate of the city, she beheld Him laden with that heavy cross, which she had not seen before, she became half dead with sorrow, and could not utter a word; nor yet could the Lord speak to her, for He was hurried on by those who led Him to be crucified. But, going on a little further, He turned to the weeping women, and said, *Daughters of Jerusalem, weep not for Me*, as is more fully set forth in the Gospel. And *on these two spots appear remains of churches, which existed, indeed, within the memory of man, as I had from one of our brethren who saw them, who tells me too, that the Mount of Calvary on which Christ was crucified, was about as far distant from the gate of the city, as our dwelling from St. Germanus's gate; so that the distance for His cross to be borne was very great.* When, therefore, He had gone further, and was *so wearied and crippled that He could bear it no more, He laid it down.* But these wicked men, unwilling to delay His death, fearing lest Pilate might recal His sentence, since he showed a wish for letting Him go, compelled another to bear His cross; but Him, thus relieved, they led as some thief bound to the place called Calvary. Do not then these sufferings of His *at matins, at prime, at tierce*, seem to you, even without His crucifixion, to have been most violent and bitter griefs, to have been awful and dreadful scenes? Truly, I think so; I think them most fitted for moving us to sorrow with Him, as being most fitted for moving Him to sorrow. Thus, then, we seem to have finished what was to be said on these three hours for the present; let us now see what came to pass at His crucifixion and death, i. e. *at sext and none;*

afterwards we shall take account of those events which followed His death, namely, *at vespers and compline.*—Life of Christ, pp. 220—222.

According to Mr. Oakeley, therefore, the Lord laid down his cross, when he "was so wearied and crippled with it that he could bear it no more." According to Dr. Pusey, *he did not lay it down,* but fell "through faintness under the exceeding weight" of it, and would "have died under this heavy burden if the Jews had not laid hold on a passer-by to lighten his burden." And to make this contradiction the more extraordinary, Dr. Pusey in the very next meditation represents the Lord as carrying His cross the whole way to Calvary—which really would give one the idea (shocking though it be) as if it seemed to him a trivial matter how the fact was represented.

It was not without extreme pain that JESUS, *laden with a heavy cross,* ascended the Mount of Calvary to be crucified. The Saviour was weak, agonized, exhausted in strength through the severe fatigue He had gone through, of walking from court to court, *from one extremity of Jerusalem to the other;* through the different outrages which He had endured at the houses of His judges, and *through the prodigious quantity of Blood He had shed during His Scourging and His Crowning with Thorns.*—Guide to Lent, p. 271.

A little further on, another circumstance is introduced, which will show with what careless indifference to truth, or even to probability, these statements are made.

Scarcely had This Divine Saviour arrived on the mount, than they began to take off from Him His Crown of Thorns; and, in taking it rudely off, they caused fresh streams of Blood to flow from all parts of His Head. After this they took off from Him His garments; and the hands of His tormentors, accustomed to violence, tore from Him His raiment, glued as it was to His wounds by His blood, which renewed to Him all His Pains. Thus they discovered to the eyes of the people, for the second time, that virginal Body, Whose innumerable Wounds, Contusions, Bruises, Weakness, livid Colour, and clotted Blood, formed the most grievous and most sad of spectacles.—Ibid., pp. 272, 273.

If this be true, the crown of thorns was removed from His head *before* the Lord was crucified; but in a subsequent meditation the reverse is stated:—

From the sole of the Foot even to the Head, all in this crucified Saviour suffers, and all suffers in all extremity. His Head is pierced with a thousand Wounds; and this Son of Man, although Lord of heaven and of earth, has not where to lay His suffering Head, but upon His Cross. Oh, cruel necessity! for, alas! this hard Cross, by pressing His Head, far from easing It, *forces those pointed thorns which surround It yet further in*, and He must needs hold It bowed down.—Ibid., pp. 295, 296.

And again, later in the volume—

The Head of this expiring Saviour, surrounded with thorns, pressed cruelly, and pierced on all sides, has but the wood of the Cross on which to repose.—Ibid., p. 338.

And in describing the taking down from the cross, Dr. Pusey says expressly—

They begin by taking off that crown of thorns which was resting on his head, even after his death.—Ibid.

Totally forgetting, or else deeming it a matter of little moment, that he had previously stated that the soldiers had rudely torn it off as soon as the Lord arrived at Calvary. Would such indecent disregard of truth be tolerated in any other description of writing?

CHAPTER XXI.

MORE INSTANCES: THE DARKNESS—THE TAKING DOWN FROM THE CROSS—A SERIOUS QUESTION—DR. PUSEY'S PRAYER TO PROVIDENCE.

ANOTHER instance of this irreverent carelessness (for by no milder term can it be described) is found in the mention of the miraculous darkness. In one place Dr. Pusey states that from the sixth hour to the ninth the sun was eclipsed, (p. 337;) whereas, afterwards he represents this darkness as commencing immediately after the Lord expired.

JESUS DEAD UPON THE CROSS.

Scarcely had the Saviour closed His Eyes, scarcely had He consummated His Sacrifice, by expiring upon the Cross for the sins of men, than all things burst forth in prodigies, than all things weep, according to their manner, for the Death of their GOD. *The sun is darkened*, and refuses to lighten the world, because CHRIST, its Creator, the true sun of Righteousness, Who lightens heaven and earth, is eclipsed, &c.—Ibid., p. 372.

The account of the taking down from the cross has already been referred to, but it will be necessary to transcribe it, not only as a specimen of this style of meditation, but in order to place Mr. Oakeley's narrative of the transaction by its side. Having stated that Joseph begged the Lord's body from Pilate, Dr. Pusey proceeds—

Nicodemus, that true Israelite, who had been a secret disciple of the Saviour, then declared himself openly, by

joining with Joseph in this holy action. He bought the things necessary for the Burying and for the Embalming; and, accompanied by the Blessed Virgin, St. John the Evangelist, Mary Magdalene, and several other holy women, they came to Calvary, where JESUS was still Dead upon the Cross. They climb that Sacred Tree; they begin by taking off that Crown of Thorns which was resting on His Head, even after His Death; they unfasten His Hands and His Feet with a deep respect, mingled with sorrow; they lower slowly and reverently that Sacred Body. Mary, all desolate and weeping, receives him upon her maternal bosom; she presses Him closely in her arms, she imprints on Him a thousand chaste kisses, and she sprinkles with her tears that Body which the HOLY GHOST had formed from her blood, and Which she had nourished at her breast.

We may well imagine, that Mary Magdalene must again have taken possession of His adorable Feet, that she bathed Them with her tears and wiped Them with her hair, as she had done before at the house of the Pharisee; that John, whom He loved above others, took the liberty of kissing that Heart, upon which he had had leave to repose, and that all that holy company strove to mark their sorrow and their love.

They carefully wash that Body dyed with Blood, and in washing It they discover Wounds which before they had not perceived. They dry It with the linen, they embalm It "with an hundred pounds of spices, and they wind It in the clean linen clothes as the manner of the Jews is." Unite thyself to these holy souls, and render in spirit with them, the last duties to the adorable Body of thy Saviour.

They take up this Sacred Burden, to carry it to the sepulchre; they walk in order, whilst Angels were invisibly accompanying this funeral pomp; whilst sighs and sobs, cries and groans, were filling up the melancholy harmony. —Guide to Lent, pp. 382, 383.

Compare with this Mr. Oakeley's Meditation. Having stated that the Blessed Virgin, St. John, Mary Magdalene, and others, remained sitting before the cross after the soldier (whose name, Mr. Oakeley tells us, "is said to have been Longinus,"*) had pierced the Lord's side, he proceeds:—

CHAPTER LXIV.

MEDITATION FOR VESPERS.

But, again, they see several other persons coming along the road, who were Joseph of Arimathea, and Nicodemus, bringing with them others, with instruments for taking down the body from the cross; and they had brought with them about a hundred pounds' weight of myrrh and aloes, and they were coming to bury our Lord. Upon this, they all rise up in great alarm. Gracious God! how severe is this their affliction to-day! But John, looking about him, said, "I see that it is Joseph and Nicodemus." Upon this, our Lady taking courage again, says, "Blessed be our God, who has remembered us, and sends us assistance, and has not forsaken us. Do you, my son, run to meet them." John then goes quickly to meet them; and, upon his coming up to them, they embrace each other in turn with great weeping, not being able *for a full hour* to speak to each other, by reason of their tender compassion, and abundant weeping and grief; they afterwards come over against the cross. Joseph inquires, who those are with our Lady, and what has become of the other disciples. John tells him who the women are, that are there. But, touching the disciples, he answers that he does not know

* Mr. Oakeley says—"One of them, whose name is said to have been Longinus, at that time unbelieving and proud, but afterwards converted, a Martyr, and a Saint, &c." Is Mr. Oakeley ignorant of what respectable Roman-catholic writers would say to this fable?

what has become of them, for that none of them have been there during the day. He also inquires about what had been done to our Lord, and John describes to him everything as it took place. But when they came near the spot, bending their knees and weeping, *they worshipped our Lord.* Then, drawing near, they were reverently received by our Lady and her companions, who bent their knees, and inclined themselves to the ground. They, in like manner, bending their knees and greatly mourning, continued for a long hour. At length, our Lady says; "You do well in thus remembering your Master, for He loved you greatly; and I confess that, since you have come, a new light seems to have beamed upon me; for we were at a loss what to do. May our Lord reward you!" They, on their part, answered; "We are grieved with all our heart at what has been done to Him; for the wicked have prevailed against the Righteous; gladly would we have rescued Him from so great injustice had it been in our power. We will, at least, render this poor service to our Lord and Master." They then arose, and prepared to take down the Body of Jesus.

Do you now attend, as I have directed you in many places, diligently and fixedly, to the mode of taking down the sacred Body. They place two ladders, one against either arm of the cross. Joseph goes up the ladder at the right side, and tries hard to draw out the nail from His hand. But this it is difficult to do; for the nail is thick and long, and strongly fixed in the wood, and, without violently bruising the hand of our Lord, it does not seem as if it could be effected. But there is no rude violence in the act, for he does it in a loyal spirit, and it is thus our Lord graciously receives it. As soon as it is drawn out, John makes a sign to Joseph, that he should hand the nail to him, that our lady might not see it. Then Nicodemus drew out the other from the left hand, and, in like manner, gives the nail to John. Then Nicodemus came down, and proceeded

to draw out the nail which fastened the feet. Joseph, meanwhile, supported the Body of our Lord; happy Joseph! who enjoyed the privilege of thus embracing our Lord's Body! Then our Lady reverently took the right hand as it hung down, and presses it to her mouth. She gazes upon it and kisses it, with floods of tears and dolorous sighs. As soon as Joseph had drawn out the nail which fastened the feet, within a while he came down, and then they all receive the Body of our Lord, and lay it upon the ground. Our Lady receives the sacred head in her bosom, and Magdalene the feet, at which she had formerly found such grace. The others stand round, and all make great lamentation over Him, for they all mourn for Him in greatest bitterness, as one that mourneth for his only son.

CHAPTER LXV.

THE HOUR OF COMPLINE.

After a little delay, when night was approaching, Joseph asks our Lady to permit Him to be wrapped in linen clothes, and buried. She withstood, saying, "Do not, O my friends, take the Body of my Son so quickly; or, if you will, let me be buried with Him." Moreover, she wept with tears which nothing could assuage, as she looked on the wounds of his hands and side, first on one, then on another; as she looked at His divine countenance, and head, and saw the punctures of the thorns, the places where the hair had been plucked from the beard, and the face defiled with spittle and blood; nor could she gaze and weep enough. As to the plucking of the beard, it admits of proof from Scripture. For Isaiah says, *I gave My back to the smiters, and My cheeks to them that plucked off the hair.* Thus His Mother, having diligently surveyed all these vestiges of His passion, *wished for time to dwell on them at her leisure.* However, as it was growing late, St. John says, "O Lady, let us grant the suit of Joseph and Nicodemus, and suffer the Body of our Lord to be composed

and buried; for, if we delay too long, It may experience some insult from the Jews." At these words our Lady, full of gratitude and prudence, considering that she had been consigned to St. John's care by her Son, would stand out no longer; and, blessing Him, permitted His sacred limbs to be composed and wrapped in linen. Whereupon John, and Nicodemus, and the rest, began to wrap the Body in linen clothes, according to the custom of the Jews. Our Lady the while held his Sacred head in her hands, reserving to herself the privilege of composing It, Magdalene applying herself, as usual, to the blessed feet. For when they come, in the discharge of their office of duty, near the feet, Magdalene interposes; "I beseech you, let me arrange the feet, for at these it was that I obtained mercy." Her petition being granted, she reverently took the feet into her hands, and held them. At the same moment she seemed on the point of swooning for grief; and those very feet, which she formerly wet with the tears of compunction, she now bathed with far more copious tears of grief and compassion. As she looked on those feet, so mangled, pierced, shrivelled, and clotted with blood, most bitter and profuse were her tears. For, as the Truth had said of her, *she loved much;* therefore was it that she wept much, and chiefly in these last funeral obsequies of her Lord and Master, thus bruised, scourged, wounded, and dead, and, as it were, brought to nought. Scarcely could her heart remain in her body for grief. Rather we may well believe that, if she could, she would readily have yielded up the ghost at her Lord's feet. She saw no remedy for her grief, nor was she an adept at offices such as this. It was a new and a last duty this which she was fulfilling towards Him; and, in the discharge of it, very bitterly was her soul wounded, because she could not perform it with the exactness and solemnity she could have wished. For she would have liked to bathe the entire Body, and to anoint it, and to compose it suitably; but

neither the time nor the place favoured her wishes. She could not do more; she could not do otherwise; she did what she could. If she did no more, at least she washed His feet with her tears; and, before she ended, she devoutly wiped them, embraced them, kissed them, wrapped them up, and arranged them carefully to the very best of her knowledge and ability. When the Body was thus prepared, they all turn their eyes to our Lady, as if waiting for her to complete the office; and all betake themselves to weeping. At length, our Lady, seeing that further delay was impossible, bends over the face of her sweetest Son, and says, "O my Son, I hold Thee dead in my bosom; very bitter is this parting; pleasant and full of delight was our intercourse, nor ever gave we cause of offence to others; yet Thou, O sweetest Son, hast erewhile been slain like a malefactor. Faithfully, O my Son, have I served Thee, and Thou, me; but, in Thy last bitter agony, it was not Thy Father's will to succour Thee, and I lacked the power. Thou didst abandon Thyself for love of mankind, whom thou wouldest redeem. Very painful and afflictive is that Redemption, in which nevertheless I joy, on account of man's salvation. Howbeit, in Thy pains and Thy death I have great cause of sorrow; for I know that Thou never sinnedst, and that, without a cause, Thou wert slain by this most bitter and shameful death. And now, O my Son, our union is broken, and I must part from Thee. I will bury Thee then, I thy most sorrowful Mother; but, Thy sepulture over, whither shall I betake myself? Where shall I tarry, O my Son? How shall I be able to live without Thee? Willingly would I be buried with Thee, that, where Thou art, there I might be with Thee. But, forasmuch as my body cannot be buried with Thine, let me be buried with Thee in mind; let me bury my soul in the sepulchre with Thy Body; to Thee I resign it, to Thee I give it in charge. O my Son, how bitter is this parting!" And again she shed torrents of

tears, and bathed His face much more effectually than Magdalene His feet. Moreover, she reverently and devoutly washed His sacred face, and kissed His mouth and eyes, and then wrapped His head in a napkin and carefully adjusted it. Then a second time she blessed Him. Then *all fell on their knees and worshipped Him*, and, kissing His feet, raise His adorable Body, and carry Him to the sepulchre. Our Lady held the head and the shoulders, Magdalene the feet, and the rest arrange themselves between.—Life of Christ, pp. 229—235.

Now, passing by all other fictions in these meditations, will any one consider, whether it is decent to detail these imaginary acts and sayings of the Blessed Virgin at the cross, when there is not the very slightest shadow of authority for supposing that she remained there after she had been consigned by the Lord to the care of St. John; much less that she assisted at His burial? Is it not reasonable to suppose, that if she had been present, the Evangelists would have mentioned it. However, they certainly have not mentioned it; and with whatever superstitious reverence this party affect to regard her, it seems hard to conceive, how any one can take such infinitely indecent liberties with her name, who entertains that just and natural reverence for her, which instinct, no less than Holy Scripture, must lead every devout mind to feel.

The truth is—and the more any one studies these mischievous books, the more painfully I am persuaded will it be forced on his mind—the sacred persons who are the subject of these meditations, are

treated precisely as if they were imaginary and fictitious personages, introduced merely as the machinery of a myth or a poem, and whose history may be altered and ornamented at the taste or caprice of each particular author. And how such writers can fail of leading their disciples into Neologianism, or absolute infidelity, it is for others to consider.

Continually, while reading this volume of Dr. Pusey's, I have been compelled to pause, and asked myself—Can these writers have any settled belief in the truth of the facts, or the reality of the persons, which they treat in this manner? Their very phraseology leaves a painful impression on the mind. "The crucified God," (p. 346;) "this suffering God," (p. 349;) "O dying God," (p. 371;) such language forces one to ask oneself, how can a person who allows himself to use such expressions, have any idea of whom it is he is writing in this way? Again, when it is said that the Lord "desired even unto death to do the actions of *a hero* and a Saviour," (p. 119;) and on the following page, "Contemplate Jesus Christ in this sad state as *a divine hero*," (p. 120;) I cannot avoid feeling, as if these writers had already begun to regard the Lord himself as little different from a mythic character. In a Meditation on John, xi. 54, (p. 305,) Dr. Pusey endeavours to recommend a solitary life—of which he says the Lord has set the example—and this is con-

cluded by a prayer to Christ, beginning with these words, "O *Adorable and Divine Anchorite!* permit me to follow thee in Spirit, and to dwell with thee in solitude," (p. 309.) Perhaps, however, a more striking instance is in the "Day of Providence," as the fourth Sunday in Lent is called, in which Providence is spoken of and addressed as a sort of mythological personage, just as if Providence had a real existence apart from God. The meditation begins thus—

DAY OF PROVIDENCE.

PRACTICE.

At thy first awaking, offer thanks to Divine Providence for all the succour thou hast received from *Her*, since thou hast been in the world, for *the maternal care* which *She* has taken for thy guidance, and for the perils in which *She* has protected thee without thy having deserved it. Then beg *Her* humbly to continue and increase them towards thee. During the day recur continually towards *Her* by acts of faith, of confidence, and of resignation. Have *Her* ever before thine eyes; adore *Her*, that thou mayest be found worthy of *Her* favours and goodness; attribute to *Her*, and not to thine own industry, all thy good success; enter with a spirit of faith into *Her* adorable designs upon thee; go not forth, release not thyself from *Her* guidance at any time; and persuade thyself that *She* orders all that happens to thee for thy good and for thy salvation.—Guide to Lent, p. 209.

And at the end of the meditation is the following, in the former part of which Providence is addressed as a "blessed Mother;" and in the latter, the prayer is addressed to Christ, as if the whole were one

continued rhetorical personification, and the prayer directed to imaginary beings.

THOUGHTS.

O Divine Providence! powerful Disposer of all good, *blessed Mother*, ever willing to assist us in all our wants, I adore Thee, I love Thee, I put all my confidence in Thee, I render endless thanks to Thee for all the benefits I have received from Thee, and I humbly implore Thy pardon for all the unfaithfulness I have committed against Thee by my ingratitude, by my mistrusts, by my unjust complaints, and by my fears for the future. I give myself again to Thee; I put myself as a blind man under Thy adorable guidance, from which I will no more withdraw.

From henceforth I desire to follow Thee, even to the most barren deserts, to hear Thy Divine word, and admire Thy wonderful works. I will no longer be alarmed at anything if Thou be with me; and Thou shalt be my Strength, my Light, my Riches, my Hope, my Nourishment, and my Life. Thou didst lift up Thine Eyes upon the people who were following Thee; Thou didst feel for their necessities; Thou didst nourish them: Cast Thine Eyes, *O Lord*, upon my miseries; consider lovingly rather the wants of my soul than those of my body; open to me the Bowels of Thy Mercy, nourish me with that Heavenly bread of Thy Divine word; make me to hear it with the ears of my heart, and make me worthy to be often fed with that Living Bread of Thy Body and of Thy Blood, which, more supporting far than that which Thou gavest to the prophet Elias, will strengthen me for my journey, not to the Mount of Horeb, but to that heavenly abode which Thou hast promised to them that love Thee.—Ibid., p. 213.

How this sort of devotion can be compatible with really reverential feelings, it is for those who use it

to consider. But that such writing must tend to shake and loosen men's belief of the truths of Christianity, and to encourage persons of a poetical turn of mind in very deplorable self-deception, must be plain to every one who has much acquaintance with human nature.

CHAPTER XXII.

DR. PUSEY'S ACCOUNT OF THE RESURRECTION—HIS DOCTRINE OF THE SACRAMENT.

The account Dr. Pusey gives of the resurrection is remarkable on more accounts than one:—

ON THE RESURRECTION OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST.

The third day after the Death of the Saviour began to dawn; that most glorious and most happy of all days, because in it He triumphed over sin, over death, and over hell by His Resurrection, and He caused His power to shine forth, to the confusion of all His enemies: the most happy, because It gave life to mortals; day of grace, in which the Lord of heaven and earth, coming forth from the place of departed spirits,* where He had set free all the saints of the Old Testament, broken their chains, fulfilled their desires, restored them to life, and given them the glory after which they had been sighing, the most part, for so many ages, came Himself, by His own virtue, to quicken His body in the tomb, where It had been enclosed since It had been taken down from the Cross.

His glorious soul penetrated the stone of the sepulchre without opening it; He miraculously reunited Himself to His Body, restored to It life, feeling, colour, beauty, strength, motion, and *put again into His Veins the Blood He had lost during the course of His Passion.* His Body thus enlivened and become glorious, shook off the linen clothes and bands which had surrounded It, as well as the hundred pounds of spices in which It had been wrapped; and, clothed with all the attributes of that new glory which His Soul, united to the WORD, had communicated to it,

* "des limbes."—Dr. Pusey's note.

became Immortal, Subtle, Luminous, Agile, Impassible; and instantly issued from the tomb, *without removing the stone which closed it, and without breaking or hurting the seal which Pilate had caused to be put upon it*, thus beginning for the first time to exercise the functions of glory which It enjoyed.—Guide to Lent, pp. 390, 391.

These statements, that the Lord, at his resurrection, "put again into his veins the Blood He had lost during the course of his Passion,"—and that His body passed through the stone without removing it, or breaking the seal, (for which fictions Holy Scripture gives no warrant,) may possibly be intended to favour the theories, which the church of Rome maintains in order to give support to the doctrine of transubstantiation. Be this as it may, there are other passages in this volume which treat of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper in such a manner, as it would be difficult to reconcile with the doctrine of the church of England. For example, the following—

What a difference is there, in truth, between the holiness of the Temple of Jerusalem, and that of the Sacred Temples of Christianity! That was holy, because of the animal sacrifices which were offered there before the Lord; but *is not the sacrifice of* CHRIST'S *Body and Blood, which is offered in ours*, infinitely more holy and more sacred? Instead of that mysterious cloud, and holy darkness, which but feebly represented the Majesty of GOD, we have the *Adorable Sacrament** of His Body and of His Blood.—Guide to Lent, p. 218.

* So also, at p. 33, Dr. Pusey speaks of "the Adorable Sacrament."

I must beg my reader to take notice of the language Dr. Pusey here employs. How can any one call the *sacrament* adorable who does not believe in transubstantiation?

Instead of the manna, we have in the Eucharist a Heavenly Manna, which nourishes the soul. Instead of the rod of Moses, we have the Cross of CHRIST, which has overcome devils, brought the dead to life, and saved all mankind; and instead of the shew bread, we have the Bread of Angels on our Altars.

How religiously ought we then to enter them, since all therein is holy! Look with the eye of faith upon the Altar, the Choir, and the Walls themselves, and think seriously of their sanctity. Is not the Altar sacred, since it is there that the most holy of sacrifices is offered?—Ibid.

And still more distinctly on the next page:—

Think with sorrow of all the irreverences thou hast been guilty of in our Churches by thy want of religion; those easy, slothful, and indecent postures; those wandering and curious looks; those useless words; those voluntary distractions; that want of faith; that inattention to the Divine Word; that little devotion during the august Sacrifice of the Holy Eucharist, *in which the Blood of* JESUS *is shed, and His adorable Flesh given, and where this same Sacrifice wherein the Victim* is a Saviour and a* GOD, *is offered for the remission of our sins to an all-powerful* GOD, Who sees us, and Who hears us; a GOD to Whom we owe all our respect as our Sovereign, all our love as our Saviour, all our fear as our Judge.—Ib. pp. 219, 220.

* "Although CHRIST seemeth not now to offer, yet He Himself is offered on earth, when the Body of Christ is offered; yea, He Himself is plainly declared to offer in us, Whose Word sanctifieth the sacrifice, which is offered." S. Ambr. in Ps. xxxviii. § 25.—Note by Dr. Pusey.

The formularies of the church of England must be explained in a non-natural sense indeed, to make them tolerate such a statement as this. Nor is it easy to understand, how a clergyman of the church of England can use such expressions as the following:—

It is a matter of faith that the words which JESUS CHRIST pronounced over the bread and over the wine *make them His Body and His Blood*, yea convey to us His Flesh, His Blood, His Heart, His Spirit, His Soul, His Life, and His Divinity; in a word, perfect GOD and perfect Man. Behold That which we receive in the Communion; behold That which forms in us the Eucharistic Union, and a *miraculous extension of the Hypostatic Union*.

The Adorable Flesh of CHRIST, Which is purity itself, because It is the Work of the Holy Spirit, and the chaste production of *a Virgin more pure than angels*, *unites Itself to ours* by the Communion; It becomes its nourishment and its support, and communicates to it Its own incomparable purity. His precious and Divine Blood unites *Itself to ours;* It quickens it, It purifies it; and by this exalted Union we acquire a glorious relationship with JESUS CHRIST.—Guide to Lent, pp. 359, 360.

Thou wert going to quit us, O Divine Redeemer! Thou wert on the eve of suffering Thy Flesh to be broken, and of shedding all Thy Blood, and of giving up Thy Life for the love of us, and we were about to be deprived of Thy adorable Presence; but *thy ingenious and Almighty Love bringeth Itself back again*, and giveth us Thy Body and Thy Blood.*—Guide to Lent, p. 361.

* Se reproduit lui-même à la place du pain et du vin, et nous donne sous les espèces de l'une et de l'autre, &c. [Orig.] —Note by Dr. Pusey.

But a still more extraordinary passage is that in which Dr. Pusey thus speaks of Judas receiving the Last Supper:—

What must have been the feelings, and what must have been the grief of this Adorable Saviour, whilst *He gave Himself, and by His own hands*, to this sacrilegious traitor! *How sad an abiding must He have had in the heart* of that perfidious man, who was going directly after to treat of His Death, and to sell His Blood for money to the Jews, who sought how they might find occasion to take away His Life? * *Miserable and sorrowful union of the Flesh and Blood of this Lamb without spot, with the flesh and blood of this wretched and infamous profaner*, who is about to cause that Divine Flesh to be torn, and *that adorable Blood which he drank*, to be shed from a thousand wounds.

He goes to deliver up to death that living GOD Who now serves him at table, *Who gives Himself to him and Who dwells in him;* and this sacrilegious communion (which crucified JESUS beforehand, and pierced His Heart with more grievous sorrow than man ever felt,) soon concurred to crucify Him really upon Calvary.—Guide to Lent, pp. 33, 34.

To say the truth, this passage (and I must request the reader to observe, Dr. Pusey expressly states that he has modified the original, and therefore it is to be taken as a deliberate exposition of his own views on the question) seems rather to go beyond what a well-instructed Roman catholic would venture to say. But can words be framed in more direct and positive contradiction to the 29th Article

* The language on this awful subject has been modified.—[ED.]—Note by Dr. Pusey.

of the Church of England? And is it possible that the church can be destitute of power to take cognizance of such a violation of ministerial obligations, and that a person in high station, both in the university and the church, can advisedly maintain and publish such doctrine, without any one being able to call on him to retract it? Nothing can be more painful to me than to raise such a question at all; but this is so direct an affront to the doctrine of the English church, that it is impossible to avoid it.

This volume contains much more matter upon several topics, which will be found of great importance in pursuing this inquiry into the nature of the system Dr. Pusey and his party are now endeavouring to substitute for the doctrine of the English church. But, supposing the whole of the case to have now been laid before my reader, I cannot but think that I have extracted enough already (unless I am very much mistaken indeed) to satisfy any reasonable person, that there may be a greater danger to be apprehended from this movement than any that could arise even from its Romanizing tendencies. These writers have laid their hands on the foundations of the faith. Christianity itself is threatened. It is impossible that their system of meditation,—even if its details were freed from the disgusting coarseness for which Dr. Pusey evinces so incomprehensible a taste,—can fail of weakening the authority of the sacred volume, wherever this

party succeed in persuading people to adopt it. What particular form of error or superstition it is meant to disseminate, is a question of but secondary importance. It shakes the authority of revelation. It teaches men to tamper with the letter of the Word of God. It teaches men to treat the most sacred names and awful mysteries, as if the Gospel was an outline of legendary mythology, where the history of imaginary persons and events is sketched out, merely to furnish materials for the exercise of a fancy more or less refined. It undermines men's reverence for truth. And what other results can any one expect to follow from such a system, except those which have ever followed, and ever will, when ever men have been sinful and foolish enough to attempt to promote what they considered piety, by an admixture of truth and falsehood, fact and fiction, the Word of God and the vagaries of a wild and irreverent imagination?

CHAPTER XXIII.

DR. PUSEY'S MODE OF TAMPERING WITH SCRIPTURE.

Yes, it is for life we are contending. If these writers would but leave the bible unsullied by their meditations, we might forgive everything else; at least, those who had been mourning over the mischief this party have done, and the discredit they have brought on the principles of the Church of England and of genuine catholicity, might console themselves with the thought, that their folly and puerility are daily becoming more apparent, and the aim and objects of their movement more developed;—that their influence, for some time rapidly diminishing, is now all but gone;—while their power to lead the simple and inexperienced astray, is neutralized by the proofs they are continually giving of the tendency of their system, in repeated apostasies from the church. But the mischief these writers have been doing, reaches far beyond any influence they ever could possess, as the leaders of a party. Such writing will do harm to many, who would feel no disposition to adopt their notions of Catholicity and Church principles. This method of meditating and allegorizing assails the foundations of Christianity itself. As long as mankind retain their reverence for Holy Scripture, there is still

something to retreat upon. But those who teach men to make the words of the living God a sport and a toy for the imagination, lay the foundations of an incurable infidelity, and in fact have already proceeded a considerable way towards it themselves. How far they suffer their thoughts and notions of invisible and eternal things to be governed by the letter of Holy Scripture, is to such persons a question rather of convenience and taste, than of right and wrong. The text hampers and cripples them—they feel it—they confess it. Nay, on the bounds it sets to the vagaries of their imaginations, they actually set up a claim to a right to go beyond it,—to tamper with it,—to force it to take the form of their fancies;—every particular person, as may suit his particular taste, be it refined or gross. "The bible is silent—therefore we *must* speak." This is the fundamental maxim of their devotional system. Their very piety is a development of restlessness and self-will. They must alter this, and contradict the other—supply what is omitted, and imagine what is concealed; and all this (as they tell us—and it is very likely they impose on themselves more easily and frequently than they impose on others) piously, and reverently, and with one knows not what raptures of spiritual enjoyment and edification. But if morality and piety are then only real,—are then only valuable,—are then only pleasing to the Almighty,—when they are based on

truth, and the love of truth, (since he requires "truth in the inward parts," as the life, and essence, and form of all holiness and virtue,) then these men are utterly and ruinously deceiving themselves, and misleading their unhappy disciples—they are (if any can be) the blind leading the blind. And surely, if they had loved truth—if truth had been the object they sought for from the outset of this movement, —they never would have dared to pollute the oracles of God with their fictions.

Nor is it less obvious, that the effects of their teaching cannot be confined to their own followers, but that even on those who are not at all disposed to be led by them, either in whole or part, they must be mischievous. Such is the perversity of human nature—such that want of regard for truth (except for the present profit it brings) which is the unhappy characteristic of our depraved nature, that (to say nothing of the encouragement these writers are giving to absolute Neologianism) there is reason to fear, lest many religious persons, who are anything but inclined to sympathize with Romanizing notions or practices, may be found but too willing to admire these spiritualizings, and allegories, and meditations, and imaginings. It is by no means necessary for a man to have Romeward inclinations, in order to his allowing his imagination to take liberties with Holy Scripture. One need only open any popular commentator, to find, how far

some men have allowed themselves to go in this way, who were very good protestants, and who would never have dreamt of *asserting a right* to meddle with Scripture, in the manner they really have done without observing what they were doing. Still, it would be preposterous and untrue to represent the conjectures of Thomas Scott, for instance, objectionable as they often are,—or even what seems to come much nearer to these people's pattern—the traditionary fictions of Bishop Jeremy Taylor—as in any way resembling the system of Mr. Oakeley and Dr. Pusey. These writers make the sacred narrative disgusting—they seem to take an unnatural pleasure in doing so. They do worse—they contradict it; they represent facts in a way in which they could not possibly have taken place. If, for example, the crown of thorns remained on the Lord's head till it was taken off by Joseph and Nicodemus, it could not have been removed by the soldiers before he was crucified. If the miraculous darkness commenced after his death, it could not have begun some hours before. Yet, in both cases, Dr. Pusey, as I have already shown, makes these two contradictory statements in different places in his book,—just as if he thought, and wished others to think, that, provided he was only *meditating*, it was of little or no importance whether he spoke truth or not, or was even decently consistent with himself.

Again; the accounts of the Lord's burial, which

I have transcribed in Chapter XXI., are utterly at variance with the narrative of the Evangelists. There is not a word to justify the notion, that the women took any part in preparing His body for interment, or had any share in His burial, beyond being mere spectators. They followed:—they watched where the body was laid. Some of them seem to have remained for some time after, sitting over against the sepulchre. But there is not the slightest reason to suppose, that they took any part in what was done; nor, indeed, is there any proof, that, at the time, they knew who Joseph and Nicodemus were.

Still more preposterous are the statements, that John and Nicodemus and Joseph remained weeping in silence "for a full hour,"—and that, after this, when they joined the women, they all continued mourning for another "long hour"—before they had even prepared to take down the body,—and that it was the approach of *night* and the fear lest the Jews should insult the Lord's body, which induced His mother to allow it to be buried. It is needless to point out to the most moderately informed person, that the interval between the Lord's death and the beginning of the Sabbath, was totally too short to allow of Mr. Oakeley's account being true. He really seems to write, as if he did not know that the Sabbath began at sunset. If I had met the meditation anywhere else, I should feel certain that this

must have been the case; but, unfortunately, this party have given too many proofs that they are totally regardless of historical truth, consistency, and probability in the construction of their meditations.

But I should never come to an end, if I were to cite all the instances these books contain of their extraordinary treatment of Holy Scripture;—of their want of reverence, as well for truth, as for the letter of the sacred text. In the very beginning of his Adaptation of Avrillon's Guide to Lent, Dr. Pusey has the following:—"It is not, in reality, material bread alone, *says Christ*, which sustains the life of man, but the 'Word which proceeds from the mouth of God,' for that *divine Word* is the life itself."—p. 1. Is it to be believed that Dr. Pusey imagined he was correctly quoting the Lord's words: or that he supposed "*every* word"—ἐπὶ παντὶ ῥήματι —could mean "*the Word*"—"*that divine Word*" which is "the life itself"?

Again:—

> Three persons had the honour of kissing JESUS CHRIST: Mary, His divine Mother, while she still pressed Him to her chaste bosom; the *priest* Simeon in the Temple, and Magdalene in the Pharisee's house.—Ib. p. 104.

Who told Dr. Pusey either that Simeon was a *priest*, or that he *kissed* the infant Jesus? Even Mr. Oakeley has not ventured so far as this. Again:—

"His blood," said this blinded people, "be on us, and on our children." Such is the cruel sentence they pronounce against themselves—a sentence which has been executed, which is executed, and *which will be executed even till the Day of Judgment*, in order to repay the unjust and cruel sentence which they extorted by violence from the mouth of Pilate.—Ib. pp. 247, 248.

Surely Dr. Pusey cannot believe this to be true. Again:—

The wicked shall go away into everlasting punishment, and the righteous into life eternal. Such is the terrible conclusion of that most fearful day. Think then again of that sight in all its dread array; the sun eclipsed, the moon stained with blood, the stars darkened, the earthquakes, the opened tombs, the dreadful appearance of the cursed who rise from them,—*all men suddenly dying, and re-living again directly.*—Ib. p. 53.

A statement, as little in agreement with Scripture as with the doctrine of the creed.

In the explanation of the words—"When a strong man, armed, keepeth his palace, all his goods are in peace," (Luke xi.) the *strong man* is all through explained to signify Christ himself. "He is himself this strong man armed, attentive to keep his palace, which is our soul."* Does Dr. Pusey really mean to say, that this is what the Lord intended by the parable?

Again:—

First, says the Evangelist, JESUS "must needs go through Samaria, *because* He had made to Himself a law of love to seek sinners.—Ib. p. 194.

* pp. 154—7.

But there would be no end of noticing particulars of this sort. I have selected these because they do not touch on controversial questions, and will serve to illustrate that which is more important than any particular error of doctrine—namely, the habit of mind which views the word of God as something to be played with—something to which any sense or meaning may lawfully and innocently be given to suit the occasion of the moment, or the fancy of the commentator. Clear it is, (at least I should think it very uncharitable to suppose anything else,) that, if Dr. Pusey had considered it sinful to treat the sacred text in this manner, he would have subjected passages like these to such a process of adaptation as would have rendered them less objectionable.

CHAPTER XXIV.

DR. PUSEY'S ROMANIZINGS—SUGGESTIONS TO YOUNG PENITENTS.

As to the Romish character of this Adaptation of Avrillon, the passages extracted in Chapter XXII. must have prepared our minds for anything of that sort. When we read that "the blood of Jesus is shed" in the Sacrament,—that in the Eucharist a "Sacrifice wherein the victim is *a* Saviour and *a* God, is offered for the remission of our sins to *an* all-powerful God;"—that when Judas received the communion, he drank "that adorable blood," and that "the flesh and blood of the Lamb without spot" were united "with the flesh and blood of this wretched and infamous profaner," and that by this means Christ *dwelt in him*, and *abode* "*in the heart* of that perfidious man,"—after such statements, we can hardly feel surprised at any further proofs of Romanism,—however surprised we may feel at finding Dr. Pusey still talking of *neutrality*, and of *our* church, and disclaiming (if this be the meaning of his late letters) any right to *teach* Roman doctrine. But surely Dr. Pusey is not so unacquainted with the meaning of theological language as to adopt such a description of St. Peter as the following, unless he were prepared for more than he has yet avowed:—

His first Apostle, *whom He had destined to be the shepherd of His sheep, the head of his Church*, &c.—Ib. p. 134.

Dr. Pusey can hardly require to be told, that in these words is contained the essential principle of Romanism.*

But this Guide to Lent is a devotional work, and perhaps nothing can be more illustrative of the pietism of Dr. Pusey's party than a passage in his preface, in which he explains the sort of mortifications he thinks people ought to practise.

Dives "was clothed in purple and fine linen, and fared sumptuously every day." If we cannot use hair-cloth and herbs, at least we may shrink from "his good things;" to lie hard may be a corrective of self-indulgence, and can injure no frame, and suits disciples of Him Who had not where to lay His Head; *to lie low* may be the type of lowliness; *rough or coarse garments*, of the prickly fig-leaves, which were a natural token of penitence; to "*smite upon the chest*" *or* "*the thigh*" are scriptural expressions, and means of humiliation; *to smite the face*, as it suffuses it anew with the hue of early shame, so it helps to the feeling which it expresses, and may bring to mind how thus also He, our Divine Saviour, for us "hid not His Face from shame;" *the ancient mode of praying with the arms outstretched in the form of a cross*, puts a person into a very solemn relation with the Passion of our Lord, Which it reverentially represents, and by its very attitude pleads for mercy through It; it confesses in action, "and we indeed

* And yet, in his preface, Dr. Pusey seems rather to profess to have omitted passages relating to the papal supremacy. See the passage in Chapter XVII., p. 165.

A subsequent reference to the Oxford translation of Tertullian makes it still more difficult to know what he really intends to teach.

justly :" *to pray* "*with the face* ON *the earth*," though not otherwise punitive, acknowledges that "our soul cleaveth to the earth," that we, bowed down by earthly cares and pleasures, and joys, and weariness, have lost that uprightness which God gave us ; have brought ourselves "down to the dust of death," have crept on the ground, when our Lord from Heaven called "Arise and follow Me," and cannot "raise ourselves, unless Christ again raise us on His Cross :" that we have again deserved that sentence, "Dust thou art and unto dust shalt thou return," and pray to be quickened from amid the dust, with Him to be "lifted up from the earth."

In this way, to spiritual humiliation and its acts, which is the end of our Lenten and all our other fasts, there is no bound. Every act, unperceived by men, may to our "Father Who seeth in secret" be an act of humiliation and penitence. Everything (we know) may be done either to ourselves, or to men, or, "to the glory of God ;" and hence we have authority for doing every the least thing (if God gives us grace) in a penitential spirit. Lent was, according to the ancient rule, a time for keeping "strictest watch and ward over every avenue of the senses ;" we need, in these days, much rule over speech, which Holy Scripture speaks of as a grace of such especial difficulty ; instinct oftentimes and experience and Holy Scripture have pointed out silence as a mode of self-discipline and collectedness ; we should be silent at times, as unworthy to use speech, which we have so often abused ; never interrupt, always allow ourselves to be interrupted, as being of all the least ; never resent ill, not only as an act of charity, but as persons of whom did God reveal all which has been or is within us, so much ill might be related ; *never complain of ills, in the Church or otherwise*,* as deserving or

* Can Dr. Pusey be serious? Or are his perpetual complaints of every one in and over the church a more refined species of self-denial? It is amazing.

contributing to all. The wandering of our eyes we might restrain, and *fix them on the ground*, as unworthy to lift them up; wait on ourselves, or accept with great thankfulness and inward shame the services of attendants, as being ourselves the last, they the first; visit the poor and sick, as our superiors in God's sight and His friends; act to all, as enforcing upon ourselves, that all are to be preferred to us; be ashamed that anything must be done for us; give way to all; *take, everywhere that we can, the lowest, and last, and worst place or thing*, simply as our desert; *do any irksome secular occupation which may come before us, as most suiting persons so unspiritual as we*—as owning ourselves fitter for the hard service in the brick-kilns of Egypt, than for cultivating the lot of our inheritance; fill up our broken intervals of time with words of the penitential Psalms, in our secret hearts; be glad of every thing which crosses our senses, as most fitted for us; be thankful for pain, or reproach, or ill-esteem, as our fittest portion; take our food, as unworthy of it, through our abuse of God's creatures; drink (if so be) a cup of cold water, with a secret confession that we deserve to be in hell, where the rich man longed in vain that his tongue should be cooled with one drop from the finger of Lazarus; lie down to rest, as deserving only to lie down where there is no rest, yet trusting, through His mercy, to lie down in "the Everlasting Arms." Actions of this sort have been indefinitely multiplied: rather these are but very common and petty actions of the sort, which yet have been found useful in forming habits of humility; as being common and every-day actions, they may be done the more easily to God alone: unsuspected by men, they will lead on to others, and may be forming in us that "broken and contrite heart which God will not despise;" only that in the feeling of our own unworthiness, we must ever keep His Cross in sight, and "out of the deep" of our misery, "call to the deep" of His mercy.

Such acts as these are, of course, given as specimens only to *beginners;* they who are more advanced will be guided by Him Who has led them thus far; it need hardly be said that such as the writer would not suggest a rule.

This is a long extract, but it is very characteristic, and the notion of its being intended for "beginners" is so wonderful, so plain a proof, either of an ignorance of human nature almost inconceivable, or else of a settled design to drill young people by degrees into habits that will prepare them for something unavowed, that it cannot be too attentively considered. Let any man, who has had much experience in the guidance of *beginners*, ask himself, how many young persons he has ever known in the course of his ministry whom he should feel disposed to *recommend*, to wear "rough or coarse garments," —"to smite upon the chest or the thigh,"—"to smite the face,"—to adopt "the ancient mode of praying with the arms outstretched in the form of a cross,"—"to pray with the face ON the earth"—to keep his eyes fixed on the ground,—and he will have no difficulty of coming to a just conclusion. To say nothing of the follies and superstitions and self-conceit to which the *recommending* of such practices must inevitably lead, it seems perfectly plain, that any attempt to anticipate experience and the work of the Holy Spirit, by teaching young people to force such feelings of humiliation, as,—at their age, and with their degree of religious experience,—can

be no other than unreal and unnatural, must end either in making them hypocrites or fanatics.

Nor is it possible, to feel any confidence in the tone of humility which is given to this passage. Of all species of pride, the most offensive is that which is everlastingly wearying mankind with professions of humility, and talking, at every other sentence, of being the least and the lowest, and, in fact, the author of all the misery of the church, at the very moment it is putting itself forward, on every possible opportunity, as the leader of revolution, the guide of the church, and the corrector of its rulers.

As to the rules of mortification here recommended, they are such as form part of the discipline imposed by the Jesuits on their Novices. Praying with the arms outstretched in the form of a cross, and restraining the eyes by keeping them fixed on the ground, are practices familiar to every one at all acquainted with the Jesuit system.

CHAPTER XXV.

MR. OAKELEY'S AND DR. PUSEY'S MEDITATIONS ON THE LIMBUS PATRUM.

To proceed, however, with Dr. Pusey's Romanizings.

In the Roman-catholic translation of Bonaventure's Life of Christ, the seventy-first chapter is headed, "Our Lord Jesus descends into the Limbo of the Fathers." In Mr. Oakeley's version, he has avoided the use of the word *Limbo*, and entitles the chapter as follows:—

HOLY SATURDAY OUR LORD DESCENDS INTO HADES.

It now comes to consider what our Lord did on this same Sabbath-day. Immediately after his death, He went down to Hades, to the holy Fathers, and stayed among them. Then they were in glory; for the sight of the Lord is perfect glory. Here consider and observe how unspeakable was His kindness in going down into hell; how great His love; how great His humility. For He might have sent one of His angels there, and have released all His servants, and presented Himself where He pleased; but this would not have agreed with His infinite love, and profound humility. He went down, therefore, in His own person, and visited them, not as servants, but as friends, He, the Lord of all, and abode with them in that place of departed souls till near daybreak on the Sunday. Think well on these points, admire, and *strive to imitate*. The holy Fathers were in high jubilee at His approach, and filled with infinite delight; every pain, every disquietude was banished at once; and they stand before Him, singing

canticles of praise, on the which songs you may meditate in the following way. Imagine their glorious bodies as they were after the Resurrection, and together with them the most loving soul of our Lord Jesus Christ. As soon, then, as they became conscious of His saving approach, they meet Him with joy, mutually exhorting one another, and saying; "*Blessed be the Lord God of Israel, for He hath visited and redeemed His people*," with the rest of that Divine hymn; "*Lift up your heads, for your redemption draweth nigh; Rise, O Jerusalem, loose thyself from the bands of thy neck;* behold thy Saviour cometh, to loose us from our chains. *Lift up your heads, O ye gates, and be ye lift up, ye everlasting doors, and the King of Glory shall come in.* We worship Thee, O Christ, and bless Thee, O Thou most loving God." And, falling down, they worshipped Him with joy and great gladness. Consider them, for they stand near Him with reverence and great delight, and countenances beaming with joy, and speak the foregoing words in His presence; and in suchlike praises, and canticles, and jubilations, continued they in the place of the departed till near daybreak on Sunday. With them also was a multitude of the Angels, singing praises with them. Then our Lord took them, and led them in triumph out of Hades, and set them in the Paradise of delights. Then, after a short space passed in joy with them, with Elias and Enoch, who recognise Him, He told them that the time of His Resurrection was at hand. Then they all fell prostrate and said; "Go, O Lord, Thou King of Glory, and return quickly, if it pleaseth Thee, for we burn with loving desire to behold Thy most glorious Body." —Life of Christ, pp. 242, 243.

This may be thought wonderful enough. But, certainly, it is not by many degrees so wonderful as Mr. Oakeley's defence of it. In his preface, he says—

There are . . . two points for contemplation retained in the following pages, which may require a distincter notice, as being less of the nature of what may be called (in a very solemn sense) *meditative poetry*, than *actual traditionary impressions of the Catholic Church*, supplemental to the text of Scripture. 1. The Appearance of our Lord upon the Day of His Resurrection to his Mother. 2. His announcement of His Resurrection to the blessed "Spirits in prison," the holy Fathers, and deliverance of them from their state of expectancy.—Ibid., p. xvi.

Having disposed of the first of these supplements to the text of Scripture, in the manner the reader has already seen in Vol. I., Chapter XL., Mr. Oakeley proceeds:—

As to the Meditation on the Visit to the holy Fathers after the Resurrection, it has been preserved in the present translation for the following reasons:—The devout soul is ever with its Lord, picturing him in some act of bounty, or some attitude of love. It will, it must think of Him, who is its Life; and it is the property of Love to cling to those who come with the mere profession of news from its Beloved, and to catch even at *rumours*, where it is denied assurance. Having, then, been with its Lord in His Passion, following Him throughout each variety of pain and grief, the soul *will not be kept* from its appointed consolation of dwelling on Him with a like intentness in the season of His glory on earth; yet *dwell on Him in the abstract it cannot; it must conceive of Him under certain accidents, and in certain relations, and for these it must draw upon other than directly Scriptural sources.* Why, again, but *as if to invite such devout inquiries*, does Scripture repeat that He performed in those eventful forty days so many more wondrous and gracious acts than it has room for? Again, if there were any period since the In-

carnation upon which it would have seemed beforehand bold to speculate, it would surely be that of the Three Days between Good Friday and Easter. Yet Scripture itself has vouchsafed, in its own natural and casual way, to intimate how our Divine Lord was employed in that interval;* thus teaching us that there is no time so blank but His *restless Love* can devise a work for it. And towards what object does Holy Scripture itself *more plainly direct our thoughts* during this period, than that of a visit to the Saints of the elder Covenant? The souls of those who die in sanctity, since Christ has come, are at once, as the Church has ever believed, in bliss.

Mr. Oakeley's purpose required him to say "in *heaven*," not "in *bliss*." And then it is totally and notoriously untrue that "the Church has ever believed" the Popish doctrine, that those who die in sanctity are at once in heaven.

St. Stephen "saw heaven opened" *for him*, [who authorized Mr. Oakeley to add these words?] even before His death; St. Paul longed to be "with Christ." Not so those Saints who died *before* the "Day of Christ," else would they not so anxiously have expected that Day, and "rejoiced and been glad in it" by anticipation. But what then was this Day of Christ, but the Day of days, the Day which the Lord Himself made glorious, and in which the whole Church rejoices and is glad; the Day of His Resurrection?

But is it not a gross misrepresentation to give this as the meaning of the Scriptural phrase—"the day of Christ"?

It is the coming of this great and desirable Day, which,

* 1 Peter, iii. 19.

according to the old Catholic view, our Lord went to announce on the Easter morning in that place of the departed, where, on Holy Saturday, He had "preached" the completion of His Sufferings, while His victory was as yet incomplete. Here then the Saint is but following out a train of thought suggested by Scripture, and sanctioned by the current opinion of the Church. Neither do we, on our side, seem forbidden, *in a matter thus indifferent,* to accompany Him if we please;* while yet it must be remembered that nothing in these pages is attempted to be *forced* upon those whose minds do not rather outstrip, than merely not recoil from, the hint.—Ibid., pp. xxi.—xxiii.

There may be some who may wish to know, how far Dr. Pusey is prepared to go along with all this. In his adaptation of Avrillon's "Guide to Passing Lent Holily," is the following in the Meditation for Good Friday, which will determine the question. The allusion is to the last cry which the Lord uttered before his death.

Thou criest, O Lord, with a loud voice, *that Thou mayest be heard by the holy fathers in Limbus*, who have so long *sighed after* the deliverance, which they can obtain from Thee Alone. Thou criest to forewarn them that forthwith, after having yielded up the Ghost, Thou wilt render them a most joyful visit, in order to break their chains,[1] to make them the companions of Thy triumph, and of thy glorious entry into Heaven.—Guide to Lent, pp. 364, 365.

* How can any matter relating to Christ be "*indifferent*"? It may be *true*, or it may be *false: indifferent* it cannot be.

On the word "chains," Dr. Pusey has put the following note:—

[1] Essuyer leurs larmes, omitted. The author does not seem elsewhere to have intended to convey an idea of suffering (as certainly the Fathers do not), but only a longing expectation of His coming, by which the souls of the just were to be translated to a more blissful abode and His own more immediate Presence. See, further a note at the end of Boudon, "Life hid with Christ."

Really, there seems to have been (to adopt the most charitable supposition) a degree of carelessness in the editing of this book, which it is almost incomprehensible how any one, who considered the subject of any importance whatever, could be guilty of. "The author *does not seem elsewhere* to have intended to convey an idea of suffering." Could any one have supposed that only a few pages after these words stands the following passage, in the Meditation for Easter Day? The reader will please to observe the note Dr. Pusey has appended to it.

But still more, we are to-day absolved from three decrees of death which God had pronounced in consequence of sin. The first regards all men; the second, sinners; the third, even the just. All men were condemned to a natural death, after some years of a life of labour, without giving them the hope of the resurrection. Sinners were condemned to a spiritual and eternal death, without giving them the hope of mercy. Even *the just were condemned* to a death in law, and *after their death to sigh** in *Limbus*,

* Gémir.—Dr. Pusey's note.

without fixing to them the day of his coming.—Guide to Lent, pp. 385, 386.

Does this language "convey an idea of suffering?" It seems almost incredible. Yet, after the liberties we have seen Dr. Pusey take with the sacred Scripture, why should this create surprise?

CHAPTER XXVI.

DR. PUSEY'S ADAPTATION OF AVRILLON'S GUIDE TO LENT—THE LENT FAST A DIVINE INSTITUTION—DR. PUSEY'S DOCTRINE OF EXPIATORY PENANCE, AND THE ATONEMENT.

Among the fictions contained in this volume is one of frequent occurrence, (particularly in the prayers taken from the Collects,) where it is repeatedly stated that the Lent fast is of divine institution. The following may serve as examples:—

PRAYER FROM THE COLLECT.

O Sovereign Lord, *Who hast instituted this yearly season of fasting and abstinence*, &c.—Guide to Lent, p. 48.

We beseech Thee, that in this holy season of tears, of penitence, and of grace, (wherein we chasten our sinful flesh *by those abstinences and fasts which Thou hast ordained for us*, in order *to turn aside Thy righteous anger*, to *make amends to Thine awful Righteousness*, to *put us in the paths of salvation*, and to *obtain more surely Thy mercy*,) &c.—Guide to Lent, p. 182.

If I did not know, how little Dr. Pusey allows these devotional compositions to be restrained, by any consideration of the truth of the statements they contain, I should have asked to see the proofs by which he had satisfied himself, that the Lent fast is a divine institution and ordinance. For it would be only charitable to take for granted that he must, by some means or other, have convinced himself that it is. And certainly, the alternative is very shock-

ing to think of, with such language as this before us, addressed to the Almighty.

Some persons, however, will probably be more struck by his speaking of fasting, as if it could redeem sins, and make amends to the righteousness or justice of God. But in truth the propagation of this notion seems the main design of the book. The difficulty lies in selecting from the abundance of proof. Take the following—

Deliver me from my sins which are without number, and from all the pains which are their due, *whilst I impose voluntary pains upon myself, to save Thee the sorrow of punishing me in this world and the next.*—Guide to Lent, p. 8.

Give me still more, O Lord, the mysterious oil of Thy grace. Shed this precious and Divine Unction plentifully over all my thoughts, over my desires, my feelings, my actions, my doings, my prayers, my communions, my sufferings, and the penitential exercises *which I am going to undertake during this Lent, in order to obey Thy holy laws, to obtain acquittance of my sins, to appease Thy justice,* for Thy glory, for Thy love, and for my salvation.—Ibid. p. 8.

Is it too much to say, that such prayers are at variance with the spirit of the Book of Common Prayer? Is it too much to say that they are wholly irreconcileable with the doctrine of the church, or with an honest subscription to the Article which declares of all such good works as are "the fruits of faith and follow after justification," and are "pleasing and acceptable to God in Christ,"—that they "cannot put away our sins, and endure the severity

of God's judgment"? Dr. Pusey and his party may not think these questions of much moment to decide one way or other;—but if we are to understand the tendency and design of the movement which he is urging forward, the questions are of no little importance indeed. Take another example:

"When ye fast," says JESUS CHRIST, "be not as the hypocrites, of a sad countenance, for they disfigure their faces that they may appear unto men to fast," (Matt. vi. 16.) Fall not into this snare, which the Evil one spreads for thy good works, to make thee lose all their acceptableness. On the contrary, begin thy fasts, thine abstinences, and thy holy practices, with that spiritual joy which thy Saviour demands in the gospel of the day. Rejoice then with the saints at being *by these humiliations a voluntary victim, in time, to thy sins and to the justice of* GOD; so wilt thou assuredly escape the being one day an involuntary victim in eternity.—Ibid. p. 11.

It is sad to be obliged to say it of any clergyman, but it is impossible to avoid the conviction, that a man must have had his notions of truth utterly confused, before he could have written in this manner. Supposing it possible to reconcile such doctrine, with the doctrine of the word of God and the church of England, how is Dr. Pusey to be reconciled with himself? No doubt, to be a victim and sacrifice capable of making amends to the righteousness of God, and expiating sins, and appeasing the divine justice, the victim and the sacrifice *must* be voluntary. So far he is right. But how can the victim be voluntary, and the pain be self-imposed, if they be of divine ap-

pointment, as Dr. Pusey has again and again stated? If sufferings be a divine ordinance, they cannot be self-imposed. But be this as it may,—it seems to me impossible for any man, whose religious notions are in harmony with the teaching of holy Scripture, to regard this doctrine—of voluntary and self-imposed mortifications having the power to make amends to God's righteousness and appease his justice,—as deserving of any milder censure than that of "arrogancy and impiety," with which the church has already branded it. Let any humble Christian read the following, and judge for himself:—

"Lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven," where all is enduring and eternal; but be assured that the most precious of all treasures which thou canst now lay up consists in *good works and acts of penitence*, since *that is the precious coin which enables us to gain acquittance of our debts to* GOD'S *justice, to satisfy for our sins, to obtain His grace and His love, to free us from hell, and to purchase heaven.* —Ibid., p. 13.

Are "arrogancy and impiety" too severe terms to use in describing such language?

It is, in fact, plain, (notwithstanding Dr. Pusey's endeavours, in his editorial preface, to mystify the question,) that the doctrine taught by this party is irreconcileable with the doctrine of Holy Scripture, concerning the Lord's Atonement. I shall beg my reader to consider, what the following must mean, if it mean anything at all.

Think here, in all the bitterness of thy heart, of all the more considerable sins which thou hast committed, of the evil habits thou hast contracted, of the sins which thou dost

yet daily commit; put these on one side of the balance, and in the other, put thy good works and the penitential acts thou hast done; examine them, weigh them in the balance of the Sanctuary; see if they are in any proportion, and *if* God, *Who is infinitely just, will be satisfied.*

What *atonement, what amends, what compensation makest thou to the righteous judgment of* God? *Nevertheless, it is absolutely needful that thou make some*, either in this world or in the next. It is necessary *that thou shouldest make some thyself with thine own hands;* or God will do it with His, which will be infinitely more hard to bear.—Guide to Lent, p. 69.

The very use of the word "atonement," as a "compensation" to be made "to the righteous judgment of God" by our own hands,—the notion of the good works of a miserable sinner being weighed in the balance against his sins, to determine, whether an "infinitely just" God "will be satisfied" by the *proportion*, is as utterly false and unscriptural, as it is revolting to the humility of a Christian heart. Men may sophisticate, and puzzle the question, until they have mystified themselves and their deluded followers,—but no man whose notions of the Lord's atonement were not erroneous to the very foundation, could use such language.

Imagine a clergyman of the church of England teaching men to offer up a prayer such as the following:—

PRAYER TAKEN FROM THE COLLECT.

All-mighty and most merciful God, Who crownest Thine own gifts in crowning our doings, accept our fasts, and give them a happy issue, that so, by Thy grace, they may produce in us a sincere conversion; that *they may*

serve to make amends for our sins, to propitiate Thy Justice, to punish and cure our sensuality and self-indulgence, and to work out our salvation.—Guide to Lent, p. 150.

Or this,—

We adore Thy Divine Providence in our sufferings, since Thou hast sent them to us, *only* to exempt us from the punishments of another life. *We consent* with willing heart, at this holy season, to *impose on ourselves* MOREOVER *voluntary sufferings, to appease Thy Justice.*—Guide to Lent, p. 214.

What can the word "*moreover*" mean, except to teach the doctrine of works of supererogation?

Hearken to our prayers, O Almighty GOD! hearken to our vows at this time of grace and of penitence, in which we strive to keep the yearly observances which religion enjoins us, with all the exactitude and with all the devotion we are able, that so these fasts, consecrated by the example and by the practice of Thy Adorable Son, and *so needful to us for redeeming the sins of which we have been guilty, and obtaining more surely Thy Divine Mercy*, may make us pleasing both in body and soul to the eyes of Thy Adorable Majesty, that so we may obtain eternal glory. And this we beg through the merits of the same JESUS CHRIST, Thy Son, our Lord.—Guide to Lent, p. 222.

As if the merits of that perfect and sufficient sacrifice and redemption, extended no further than to enable the sinner to redeem himself.

It is Thou Alone Who canst give to our labours and our fasts the acceptableness which they need in order *to appease thy wrath, to efface our sins, to draw down upon us Thy mercy, and to obtain eternal life,* which we hope for through the merits of JESUS CHRIST, Thy Adorable Son, our Sovereign Lord.—Guide to Lent, p. 279.

In fact, according to Dr. Pusey and his school, the sinner is redeemed and his *actual* sins atoned for, by his own voluntary and self-imposed sufferings *united to the sufferings of Christ.* Read, for example, the following:—

PRAYER TAKEN FROM THE COLLECT.

O Almighty Lord, what favours and what graces hast Thou not bestowed upon us! Thou didst create us with gifts which we miserably lost through the sin of our first parents. Thou hast had the goodness to repair our losses Thyself, by clothing thyself in our mortal flesh, by suffering and by dying for the love of us; Thou hast thus returned us with usury the gifts from which we had fallen. But, alas, O Divine Restorer! we have again disgraced, by our excesses and our intemperances, the dignity of our condition, which Thou hadst ennobled by Thine Incarnation. Grant us grace *to repair it again by our fasts, by our mortifications, and by our repentance, which we unite to Thy Sufferings*, that they may be found worthy of being presented to Thee, and of drawing down upon us Thy Mercy in this life, and glory in the world to come.—Guide to Lent, pp. 302, 303.

Upon this theory, then, *actual* sin is atoned for by the self-imposed sufferings of the sinner in this life, offering himself a voluntary sacrifice and victim to the divine justice; and, as far as such sin is concerned, the value of the Lord's atonement, (we are now taught,) consists in its giving value to the atonement which the sinner offers for himself. I submit another specimen—

PRAYER FROM THE COLLECT.

Almighty and most merciful Lord, Whose nature is

goodness itself, pour Thy grace abundantly into our hearts, and make them worthy to receive it, and to preserve it: Pour Thy Blessings also upon our works; that so we, *expiating the sins of which we are guilty, by the sharp and voluntary penitence wherewith Thou dost Thyself inspire us*, and which Thou in Thy goodness wilt accept *as an amends* which is due to Thee, may henceforth cease to offend Thee, and to incense Thy just anger by new sins: and that these chastisements *which we put upon ourselves during this life present, may exempt us from the terrible punishment of the life to come, and procure for us the advantage of possessing Thee eternally in the Heavens.* And this we beg through the merits of JESUS CHRIST, Thy Son and our Sovereign Lord.—Guide to Lent, pp. 310, 311.

So that,—as Dr. Pusey teaches his readers to believe,—good works and acts of penitence are "*the precious coin*, which enables us to gain acquittance of our debts *to God's justice*, to *satisfy* for our sins, to obtain His grace and His love, to free us from hell, and to purchase heaven;"—(p. 13,) and the merits of Christ effect these objects no further than by giving value and currency to this *coin*;—the *real* price of human salvation being our own voluntary self-imposed tortures, which, when united to the sufferings of the Son of God, constitute an acceptable and a sufficient reparation to divine justice. According to this teacher, the sufferings of the sinner are "a real satisfaction for sins." These are his words:—

Practise this patience, by the example of the suffering JESUS: ye will soon be perfect, because she will lead thee to all the other virtues, and she contains them; which made

the apostle Saint James say, "Let patience have her perfect work." (James i. 3, 4.) And truly, justice, obedience, strength, humility, and sacrifice are found in her. *Justice is found in her, because she is a real satisfaction for sins.*—Guide to Lent, p. 351.

And, in fact, (shocking to think,) he seems to treat the sufferings of Christ rather as an *example* (however meritorious) of what the sinner himself is to suffer in expiation of his own sins, than as that one and only sacrifice which, as far as satisfaction and atonement are concerned, has made an end of sin for ever. What else can be meant by the following?—

PRAYER TAKEN FROM THE COLLECT.

O Almighty and everlasting God, Who hast given us Thy adorable Son to be our Saviour, and Who, through Thy exceeding love for men, hast sent Him to take upon Him our mortal flesh, and to endure the Sufferings of the Cross, *to give us an example* of deep humility, perfect obedience, and Divine love, *grant us*, of Thine infinite mercy, *grace, and give us strength to suffer in patience for the expiation of our sins;* to obey Thy commands in all things, and to *profit by the Divine lessons which our Adorable Saviour has given to us on the Cross*, by obeying, by suffering, and by dying for our love; so that by *partaking of the infinite merits* of His Passion and of His Death, which is the Well-Spring of Life, we may also be partakers in the glory of His Resurrection. And this we beg through the merits of the same Jesus Christ, Thy adorable Son, our Lord.—Guide to Lent, p. 327.

Again,—

Although I am nothing, and merit nothing, yet, confiding myself to Thy Goodness, and to Thy Mercy, *I desire to be a victim all my life with Thee*, and to offer Thee sacri-

fices until death. But, O my GOD! purify Thyself the victim, by the fire of Thy Love, that so it may be more well pleasing unto Thee, and that *uniting my sacrifice to That which Thou dost this day offer upon the Cross, it may be more worthy of being presented to Thee.*—Guide to Lent, p. 370.

In effect, as far as I can understand Dr. Pusey's language, the sum of his teaching seems to be this,—that although they may require to be *united* to the merits of the sacrifice of Christ, self-imposed penances are a *real* sacrifice and satisfaction, and it is by them, and by nothing else, actual sin is expiated and atoned for, divine justice satisfied and appeased, and heaven purchased. The atonement and sacrifice of the cross are unavailing, unless such voluntary torments be united with them. The death of Christ, indeed, is the *example* for the sufferer; but the sinner's sufferings and good works are *the precious coin* by which admission to the heavenly kingdom and freedom from hell are to be purchased. Such is the doctrine which is deliberately, and of set purpose, taught as Christian,—as scriptural,—as catholic,—by a clergyman of the church of England. And, whether such teaching, in addition to its other obvious tendencies, (its tendency to Arianism, for example,) is not calculated to bring Christian self-denial and mortification into disrepute, and furnish plausible excuses for the luxurious and self-indulgent, seems a consideration of some practical importance.

CHAPTER XXVII.

DR. PUSEY'S RECOMMENDATION OF AUSTERITIES—ST. EDMUND OF CANTERBURY.

We have seen what sort of devotional exercises Dr. Pusey suggests for "beginners;"—rough or coarse garments,—lying low,—smiting the chest or the thigh,—smiting the face,—praying with the arms outstretched in the form of a cross,—praying with the face *on* the earth,—and keeping the eyes fixed on the ground;—advice obviously borrowed from the discipline of the Jesuit Noviciate. He has no objection also to the use of ashes on the face or head.*

* In the Guide to Lent, we find the following on Ash Wednesday:

"On the Ashes, from whose religious use the day was named. Recollect that the Ashes are a sort of Sacrament and mystery, which ought to inspire us with feelings of humility and of death, and consequently of penitence. Say to God with all thy heart, 'Lord, I desire now to put in practice spiritually on my body that which thou wilt one day do by death,'" &c.

And in a note on this passage printed at the end of the volume, he says,—

"Our church, by retaining the name, recognises the use, although she has discontinued it *publicly*. If used in private, *like all other acts* of humiliation, it should be kept for our Father which seeth in secret. [This is easily said—but it is clear that many of the acts of humiliation this party recommend, are such as could not, and indeed, are not attempted to be kept secret.] The reflections describe the frame in which it should be used, 'with a spirit of recollection and of compunction, penetrated with a sense of thy wretchedness and nothingness.'"

From which it is plain that Dr. Pusey does not discourage this practice, but the contrary.

Signing oneself with the sign of the cross also, he tells us, "has great efficacy given it; especially against evil thoughts or distractions, or suggestions of Satan."* *Disciplining ourselves to blood*, he also agrees with Bonaventure in recommending, as a practice by means of which "we may know in ourselves" what the Lord "suffered at the pillar."† He recommends also the sort of arithmetical devotion which the Romanists are so fond of,—saying the same prayer over a certain number of times. He tells us that it is "in our entire ignorance of its very nature, the name of 'the Rosary,' or 'the Beads' is associated only with ideas of superstition;"‡ and recommends "detailed devotions with reference to each of" the Lord's Five most precious Wounds, or to the Seven sheddings of his Atoning Blood for us, either with reference to the seven deadly sins, or the seven gifts of the Holy Ghost, or His seven words upon the Cross, or devout adaptations of the petitions of His prayer to them, or detailed recitations of the events of His Passion, in union with His Sacred Name,"§—for which purpose, he has printed the Litany of the Passion, at the end of Avrillon's Guide to Lent. He also recommends the Lord's prayer to be said at particular times of the day *with particular intention*:—for example, "At the great

* Guide to Lent, note (*b.*) at the end.
† Surin, p. 193.
‡ Surin, preface, p. xxvi.
§ Surin, preface, pp. xxvii., xxviii.

hours of the day in connexion with the memory of the Passion,"* a suggestion, which, he thinks, "our poor will most thankfully receive: and, as an act of intercession for the church, he advises (in the letter published in the English Churchman of October 30th) his young disciple to say the Lord's prayer three times a day in honour of the Holy Trinity, *with that intention;*"—affecting, as he now commonly does, the technical phraseology of Romanism. But these suggestions are only for "beginners." He seems rather to decline giving rules to the "more advanced."

However, there is the less need of rules for this latter class, as the lives of the English Saints supply so many examples of what *they* should do, if they aspire to sanctity. Any one who requires guidance in the higher forms of heroicity, has only to turn to the picture these hagiologists have drawn of German or Bartholomew;—or, if they rather affect cold water than nastiness—St. Neot, or St. Wilfrid may furnish them with models. The fourteenth volume, which has appeared within these few days, will supply some more varieties of these arts of self-tormenting.

The first of the lives in this volume is that of St. Edmund, Archbishop of Canterbury. His mother Mabel is described as exerting a considerable deal of ingenuity in this way.

* Surin, pref., p. xxvi.—note.

Above all, bearing in mind what Scripture says, that "She which liveth in pleasure is dead while she liveth," she had imposed upon herself the perpetual wearing of sackcloth next her skin. And to ensure that its rough surface should be always in contact with her body, she laced over it a belt, or stays of iron, which kept it tight around her.—St. Edmund, p. 3.

She also took a good deal of pains with her son, to induce him to adopt the practice of austerities, even while he was a mere child. She taught him,—

as soon as ever he was capable of understanding the meaning of the act, to fast every Friday on bread and water, she did this not severely by compulsion, but gently, giving him little toys to induce him to do it of his own accord.—Ibid., p. 5.

Yet, it may be doubted, whether anything beyond a mechanical habit was likely to be formed, by bribing a child to fast in this manner. However, if we are to believe Dr. Pusey, "real saints" are, from one cause or another, "unintelligible to common men,"—and certainly, if this be the rule, St. Edmund, according to his present biographer, does not appear to have been an exception to it. His doings at Oxford, when but twelve years of age, are too remarkable to be passed over.

When about twelve years old, his mother sent him and his brother to the schools in Oxford: And here his chief desire [*at twelve years of age*] was to preserve his body in purity, spotless, and inviolate. He sought spiritual counsel in this matter from a certain Priest, famed for his wisdom and discretion, to whom his mother had given him in charge. Under his guidance he resolved to make a private

vow of perpetual continence before God, and the ever Virgin Mother. Entering a church, accordingly, he knelt before an image of Our Lady, and earnestly prayed for succour and strength to keep his vow. Following *the suggestion of boyish fancy*, he ratified his vow by a little ceremony.

Can the reader imagine what this "little ceremony" could be?

Having two rings made with the words of the Angel, Ave Maria, &c. upon them, one of which placing on the finger of the Image, the other on his own, *he thus espoused himself to the Blessed Virgin.* This *youthful action* he kept from the knowledge of all; though within himself he never ceased to keep up the remembrance of it. But *near the end of his life*, when he had ceased to fear the demon that lurketh in the noon-day, he related it to his friends, and *requested that it might be written down for the benefit of others.* In attestation of it the very ring with the inscription was noted on his finger at his burial; and the image was pointed out as an object of curiosity in the University. His biographers mention instances in which his resolution was put to trial; when the *grace of God, and the aid of the Blessed Virgin* saved him; and it was confidently attested by those who knew him all his life, and by all his confessors, that he preserved purity of body inviolate till the day of his death.—St. Edmund, pp. 7, 8.

Dr. Pusey may well call the saints of his school "unintelligible to common men." For, truly, one can hardly tell which is most wonderful in this tale, —a boy of twelve years of age "espousing himself to the Blessed Virgin,"—or an Archbishop telling such a story of himself, and requesting "that it might be written down for the benefit of others."

It is with his penances, however, we are now concerned.

He seemed hardly to allow himself the repose of entire sleep. For though he had in his chamber a bed furnished in the usual manner, yet he did not sleep in it, but lay on a bench at the foot of it, or else on the ground.—Ibid., p. 14.

Which may serve to explain what Dr. Pusey means by lying *low*, in his advice to "beginners." But how could this be done without its being known? His servants must have known it. However, this was only during his first essays in mortification. The legend proceeds:—

But ascetic habits, like self-indulgent ones, grow upon a man. And in time he began to find the recumbent posture too great a luxury. So he would take his *rest* at night, sitting upright wrapt in his scapular, or at most in a cloak. And this practice, those who were intimate with him believed.—for so secret did he keep his austerities, that it could not be ascertained with certainty—that he had observed for the last thirty years or upwards of his life. This coupled with the most vigorous abstinence, *made his friends fear for his head.* They thought human strength could not support so much, and that he would either die under the discipline or lose his senses.—Ibid., pp. 14, 15.

An apprehension that cannot appear very surprising. But it seems they *must* have known all about his doings, notwithstanding what this writer says of his keeping them "so secret;" or else, why should they have been so much alarmed on his account?

He rose at midnight to matins, which he attended, when in Paris, at the church of St. Mery. He never re-

turned to his couch, even such as it was, after he had once risen, but spent the time which remained till daylight in prayer, weeping and groaning before the altar of the blessed Virgin in the same church and then betook himself to the schools with the rest. In short, he could never be said to sleep; but if nature was sometimes overcome during his long vigils, he would lean his head against the wall and obtain a few moments of repose as he sat or knelt. Ibid., p. 15.

Of course, secresy was out of the question here. Whether the story is true or fabulous—whether the unhappy man was deranged or an impostor—is immaterial, as far as we are concerned. What it is every way important to remark is, that this is the sort of devotion which is now held up to the veneration of foolish young people as heroical sanctity. But these are trifles compared with his prayers.

Being continually in prayer, he adopted laborious postures, and those of three degrees. First, he knelt, or rather was *continually rising, and falling on his knees*, as it were *knocking at the gate of heaven*.—Ibid., p. 22.

As if this author imagined heaven to be somewhere underground.

This always with the bare knee on the ground, so that *one of them was ever wounded and bleeding*, while *the other was covered with a protuberance of hard callous flesh*. When he had no longer the strength to rise, he continued on his knees, but prostrating his whole body, at intervals, on the ground. And lastly, when too much exhausted to continue this motion, he was *fain to content himself* with bowing his head repeatedly.—St. Edmund, pp. 22, 23.

A specimen of devotional exercise, to which there

is nothing similar in the Holy Scripture;—except, indeed, the instance of those unhappy men, who wearied themselves the live long day, crying aloud, and leaping up and down upon their altar, and cutting themselves with knives and lancets, till the blood gushed out upon them.* But they are a bad example of sanctity.

Every day he worshipped every member of Christ crucified from the head to the feet, saying as his eye rested on each, Adoramus te, Christe. And every day he said, in addition to the canonical hours, those of the Holy Ghost, and of the Blessed Virgin, adding to these the Office of the Dead.—Ibid., p. 23.

To which may be added, that—

He did not much indulge in the use of the bath, thinking purity of mind was sufficient.—Ibid.

These continual knockings with his knees on the floor, however, must have made some noise; and if they did not inconvenience others, could hardly be reckoned among *secret* austerities. It is curious that this biographer has actually noticed this, and still more remarkable is the extraordinary turn he gives it. After St. Edmund had been elevated to the see of Canterbury, the legend says—

He would spend almost the whole night in prayer, beating his breast, and falling with his bare knees on the floor, in such a way as to disturb the sleep of his clerks who were lodged in the rooms beneath. Some of them were so weary of these and his other austerities, that they

* 1 Kings, xviii.

quitted his service on various pretexts. *Thus the savour of life was to them a savour of death.*—Ibid., pp. 44, 45.

Such is the charitable conclusion of this biographer. But is this Christianity? Is one to believe that the Father of Mercies delights in these barbarous self-inflictions,—even supposing that no one else was to be tormented by them but the devotee himself? Bartholomew, we are told, wore a shirt for five years, till no one could abide him,—but suppose they could—or rather,—suppose him the solitary inhabitant of some desolate island, where no human being was ever within reach of the annoyance,—does anything in Holy Scripture—anything in primitive catholicity—warrant the notion, that the filthiness of his habits could render him more acceptable in the eyes of an infinitely pure God? St. Edmund's knockings with his knees on the floor are described as having been carried on with a total disregard of the comfort, or repose, or health of his unlucky chaplains. But, if instead of being Archbishop of Canterbury, he had been a hermit, far from the sight and sound of his fellow man, would his knockings, and prostrations, and bowings, his one knee bleeding and the other callous with continual blows—his wretched body and mind exhausted and crazed from want of rest, would such miserable inventions of a fanatical phariseeism, goaded perhaps to madness by an accusing conscience, advance him in the eyes of the God of Love? How can such torments avail

(however Dr. Pusey may labour to persuade his deluded followers to the contrary) to expiate guilt and wash away sins? It is not out of humility these tortures are inflicted. They are not an expression of sorrow and contrition. They are a price paid down for a certain benefit and reward:—for fame, and power, and influence, amongst the deluded people who are deceived into reverencing those who practise them. They are the secret of the ascetic's power and fame. They are meant to be so; whenever the secret shall escape, as (we are told) it is sure to do some time or other—if indeed such practices ever could be secret—or could be intended to be secret. This is the terrible price the ascetic pays for popularity, and admiration, and power. And worse than all—with this protracted suicide he expects (and Dr. Pusey teaches him to expect it) to be able to satisfy the Divine displeasure—to make an atonement to the Divine justice,—to wash away his sins—to purchase heaven, and save himself from hell. Is this Christianity? Is it catholicity? Does it bear the remotest resemblance to either the one or the other? The church must be in a fearful state, indeed, if any considerable number either of her clergy or laity entertain a doubt upon the subject.

CHAPTER XXVIII.

DR. PUSEY'S PANEGYRIC ON MONASTICISM—THE NUNS OF WATTON—THE MONKS OF ST. MARY'S AT YORK.

WHAT is Dr. Pusey's opinion of the monastic life, may be gathered from the following passage, which occurs in his adaptation of Surin.

QUESTION—How can we forsake all?

ANSWER—In three ways principally.

1. First, *by depriving ourselves thoroughly of all temporal goods, in order to follow literally the counsel of the Son of God: Go thy way, sell whatever thou hast, &c.* Mark, x. 21. *This is done by all who enter the cloister;* they abandon their father and mother, quit their property, and put it out of their power ever to acquire or possess anything of their own.

The Apostles once said to the Saviour, *Behold, we have forsaken all, what shall we have therefore?* Matt. xix. 27. He replied that He would give *everlasting life* to them, and to all who should follow their example in ages to come. Whoever then renounces all, obtains all, for God Himself is his recompense. Thus, Saint Francis, having made himself poor, could say with truth, God is my portion, *He is in Himself everything to me.* And, in fact, a man who strips himself of all external things, delivers himself from so many obstacles to his perfection; *he deprives the evil one of the means of tempting him, and of drawing him into his nets; he empties his soul of creatures, and fills it with God.*—Surin, p. 114.

Language, which is to the full as extravagant as

any we have had occasion to notice, either in Mr. Newman's Sermons, or in the Lives of the English Saints. But yet these writers are sometimes obliged to acknowledge, that, in practice, monks and nuns do not always come up to the standard of "Bible Christians." Their account of the state of St. Ebba's monastery has been transcribed already.* Two more instances have occurred to me in reading, which are curious enough to appear worth transcribing. One is found in the life of St. Gilbert, and is as follows:—

A monastery had been founded, as has been said before, n Yorkshire, in a place so dreary and lonely, and so surrounded with water, that it was called Watton, or the Wet-town. To this house *a little girl of four years old* had been sent by Henry, Archbishop of York, to be brought up by the nuns. The poor child had always been unruly, and the nuns had never been able to do anything with her; and when she grew up, though she wore the veil, she never had the heart of a nun. One day, the lay-brethren came into the monastery to do some work; the unhappy maiden lingered near, and watched them intently; at length her eyes met those of one of them. It is useless to go through the steps which led her to crime; suffice it that she fell. By and by her shame could no longer be concealed, and her partner in wickedness fled away. The nuns perceived what had taken place, and now comes the most miserable part of a miserable tale. Instead of taking the fall of one of the inmates of the house as matter of humiliation, *some of the nuns grew frantic with rage; they had been proud of their chastity, as giving them honour in the sight of men*, and now they began to imagine

* Vol. i. p. 131.

that the finger of scorn would be pointed at them. Instead of rejoicing that by the dispensation of God without their fault, they were despised by men as sinners, *as had happened to our blessed Lord*, they murmured against God. A party of them *cruelly beat and loaded with chains the wretched girl;* their rule obliged them to confine her, but they might have comforted her in her prison, and tried to win her back to Christ. Their next act was *to get by stratagem the partner of her guilt into their power, and to execute upon him a sanguinary and horrible vengeance.* Instead of trusting that their own purity would be asserted by him who saved St. Agnes from the place of shame, *they devised a scheme of fraud in order to conceal the event altogether.* It is needless to go into the details of their wickedness; it is enough that *they imposed on St. Aelred.* and persuaded him that the girl had repented, and had been miraculously delivered, and that the chains had dropped from her hands. It is remarkable that they did not send for Gilbert to be witness to the miracle, instead of St. Aelred; they probably thought that they could not impose upon him. But however this be, so runs the tale, and a miserable tale it is, which may make any one tremble who is disposed *to pride himself upon his austerities or his purity*, forgetting that without charity they are nothing worth. These nuns of Watton were firm and zealous rather for their own honour than for the Lord, and were betrayed into a terrible system of deceit, which now rises up in judgment against them with posterity.*—St. Gilbert, pp. 116, 117.

* It would seem that Aelred is not the only person who has been imposed on. Another of these hagiologists, the writer of the life of St. Ninian, seems to think that these "savage old maids" (as St. Gilbert's biographer calls them) were very respectable people, and guilty of no fraud in the matter. He says—"Aelred, as appears by his writings, was no friend to monks who were ever on the look out for miracles, but in this case there was no choice between accusing the nuns of a wicked fraud, and believing the truth of the miracle;

If there be any truth in this story, it does not appear quite so certain as Dr. Pusey would have it believed, that those who enter the cloister deprive the evil one of the means of tempting them, and of drawing them into his nets. And this is not the only passage in these books calculated to make one doubtful of the practical reality of the holy and beautiful theology of monasticism, as these writers would say.

In the life of St. Robert, the writer informs us, that the monks of the Abbey of St. Mary, at York, had got into rather a lax state of discipline. It does not appear that they were vicious or immoral men, or even "savage" old bachelors. "The abbot was a kind-hearted old man; but he was old and ignorant, and the monks led an easy life. A noise of chattering and laughing might be heard all over the abbey; some, indeed, kept aloof, and would go into the church to pray while others were idle. The greater part, after compline, instead of going to the dormitory, walked about, and, dividing into knots, talked about the news of the day." However, Richard, the prior, and some of the stricter sort, were determined that matters should be reformed. "But the poor old abbot trembled at the thought of innovation." On which Richard appealed to Arch-

Aelred *found that he had reason to believe that the nuns were holy women*, and thought the latter alternative by far the less difficult."—p. 116. . Between the two biographers, the story is involved in no little obscurity.

bishop Thurstan, who interfered and set the old abbot a-weeping: however, he said he would not oppose their holy resolution, only he could do nothing without the chapter. So the archbishop promised to meet the chapter: and here follows the account of the meeting:—

On the appointed day, Thurstan, with several grave and reverend ecclesiastics connected with the cathedral, went to St. Mary's abbey, to try to pacify it. When, however, they reached as far as the door of the chapterhouse, they were met by the abbot, who protested that the archbishop alone should enter, without the secular clerks who attended him. When Thurstan remonstrated, out rushed from the chapterhouse the whole convent, and with them a number of strange monks, Cluniacs and Benedictines, assembled for the occasion. Such an uproar ensued as St. Mary's abbey has never witnessed before or since. They roared, they bellowed, and they declared that they would rather suffer an interdict for an hundred years than yield an inch. Suddenly they shouted, "Seize them, seize them!" and then they attacked Richard and his friends, and would have torn them to pieces, if they had not clasped the archbishop's knees for shelter. Then they drove archbishop, monks, and clerks, altogether, pell-mell into the church, with cries of "Seize the rebels! seize the traitors!" So the archbishop quitted the monastery, and took with him the brethren thus forcibly ejected, being twelve priests and one sub-deacon, and lodged them in his house.—St. Robert, p. 49.

Of course neither of these stories are as bad as many which are notoriously true: nor should I have thought them worthy of notice, if these authors had been content to let monasticism rest on its own just

historical merits,—as a system which, with all its defects, had, in a certain state of the world and the church, its advantages,—instead of recommending it for the adoption of our church *now*, as a state of all but angelical perfection, and pronouncing monks and nuns to be the only persons deserving to be called "Bible Christians."

CHAPTER XXIX.

DR. PUSEY'S ADVOCACY OF JESUITISM—CONCLUSION.

Dr. Pusey's object, however, is evidently to recommend Jesuitism, and not merely monasticism in the abstract. In fact all through this book of Surin's, which he has adapted to the use of the English church, we meet at every turn with those pernicious principles and maxims by which that fearful system has been able to do such inexpressible mischief to Christianity. If there is one principle which experience has proved to be more destructive of piety and morality than another, it is that fundamental principle of the Jesuits, that the self-denial and self-sacrifice prescribed by the Gospel requires them to yield a blind and implicit, and corpse-like submission* to

* The passage in the Constitutions of the Jesuits to which I refer is as follows :—

Having required that such prompt obedience should be paid, that if the Superior should call, command, or even give a sign of his will, without any expressed precept, the Jesuit ought to stop, even in the middle of forming a letter with his pen—it proceeds :—

"Ad eum scopum vires omnes ac intentionem in Domino convertendo, ut sancta obedientia tum in executione, tum in voluntate, tum in intellectu sit in nobis semper omni ex parte perfecta; cum magnâ celeritate, spirituali gaudio, et perseverantiâ, quidquid nobis injunctum fuerit, obeundo; *omnia justa esse, nobis persuadendo; omnem sententiam ac judicium nostrum contrarium*, CÆCA QUADAM OBEDIENTIA *abnegando;* et id quidem in omnibus quæ a Superiore disponuntur, ubi definiri non possit (quemadmodum dictum est) aliquod peccati genus intercedere. Et *sibi quisque persuadeat;* quod qui sub Obedientia vivunt, *se*

their superiors in the society, and that, in fact, the commands of the superior are to take the place of reason and conscience, and the Word of God. This is mainly and primarily what they mean by self-sacrifice. Now, let any one who has any knowledge of their system consider the following passage in Dr. Pusey's adaptation. The chapter is headed, "How to distinguish the will of God,"—and having stated that there are three means by which we may do so, "the law of God," (of which he gives a very comprehensive description indeed, including even "the statutes and general regulations made by prelates and ecclesiastical superiors,") "the disposition of providence," and "obedience"—he thus explains the third:—

ferri ac regi a divina providentia per Superiores suos, sinere debent, PERINDE AC SI CADAVER ESSENT, quod quoquoversus ferri, et quacumque ratione tractari se sinit: vel *similiter atque senis baculus*, qui ubicumque, et quacumque in re velit eo uti qui eum manu tenet, ei inservit. (Pars. vi. cap. i. pp. 233, 234. Antwerp. 1635. Superiorum Permissu. 8vo.) The limitation in the foregoing passage, "ubi definiri non possit aliquod peccati genus intercedere,"—or as elsewhere expressed—"ubi peccatum non cerneretur,"—(Pars. iii. cap. i. § 23)—however it is relied on by the apologists of the Jesuits, can oppose but slight obstacles to those who are schooled in the doctrine of probability. And it is manifest that, if men are bound by solemn vows to persuade themselves that everything their Superior commands is just, and to deny their own opinion and contrary judgment by practising a blind obedience, yielding themselves to be moved and used as if they were corpses, or walking-staves,—such a blind obedience can scarcely admit of their stopping to consider whether the act commanded be a sinful one or not? It seems evident that such an exception is not a general one—but refers to particular cases, such as the members of the society understand.

3. There remains only the obedience due to those whom we are lawfully bound to obey. Now *we cannot doubt that in executing their orders, we execute those of God.* For the Saviour said to the Apostles, and in their person to all His ministers, *He that heareth you heareth Me*, Luke, x. 16; and St. Paul orders all the faithful to *obey them that have the rule* over them. Heb. xiii. 17. *Those who live in a community, under a head who governs them*, have this advantage over those who are free, that *they are sure of doing God's will in practising obedience.*—Surin, pp. 202, 203.

Now what crime is there, which a person of enthusiastic temper and weak judgment cannot be induced to commit, if he can only be got to believe, that when he obeys his superior in a monastic order, he is "sure of doing God's will?" Of course the whole inquiry will then be narrowed to the one question—is it the command of a superior?—if it be, conscience must be silenced.

A still wider door, however, is opened to the arts of those, whose interest it is, to wind to their purposes the fanatics whom they hold in subjection, by a fourth method of distinguishing the will of God, which Dr. Pusey describes as "inspiration." These are his words:

4. With regard to inspiration, people are sometimes deceived; and the difficulty of distinguishing between the true and the false, leaves the mind in great uncertainty as to the will of God. But it is certain that one whose intention is perfectly pure is not exposed to grievous doubts, because *acting sincerely, and desiring to do whatever is best, he can hardly be deceived*; and *in any case he will be*

excusable, if before acting he examined the inspiration, and, *for greater security, consulted with persons experienced in the spiritual life*. Moreover, those who have long been led by the Spirit of God, are in the habit of following the drawings of Grace and the direction of the Holy Spirit, and *consequently cannot then fail of doing His Divine will.* Surin, p. 203.

Certainly, unless the history of the last three centuries be a fable, men of flighty and enthusiastic temperament have, by sophistry of this sort, been repeatedly worked on by the Jesuits to commit most atrocious crimes. Their intention pure,—the greater glory of God, and the extension of the Catholic Church, objects for which they were ready to sacrifice life itself,—how easy is it for a skilful confessor to lead some Clement or Ravillac to believe, that his plot of murder and regicide is an inspiration of the Almighty—and that whether it be or not, as he has "for greater security consulted with persons experienced in the spiritual life," he himself "in any case" "will be excusable." Such things have been done. And if this is the solution of some late phenomena, and if those who have been undermining and betraying the Church, have been taught by such fearful sophistry as this, to regard themselves as the subjects of inspiration, no one need be surprised at what has taken place. Without tools of this sort—weak—amiable—imaginative—devotional visionaries—minds easily puzzled by artful casuistry—easily confused as to the distinctions

of morals, and the necessity of truth and rectitude —without such tools as these at their command, the designs of the wily enemies of our church never could succeed. It may be doubted, whether they would even be attempted.

The system of espionage and mutual distrust which pervades the whole machinery of the Jesuits is thus panegyrized by Dr. Pusey:

The state of a man who, having learned by Divine illumination the great advantage of self-knowledge, is so led to annihilate himself before God and man, as to be completely indifferent to all that is said or thought of him; to desire no privilege, nor any token of distinction; instantly to forget all injuries done to him, without seeking to do himself justice; in short, to become, as it were, insensible to all that concerns his own interest. One who has been enabled to arrive at this state, whatever his merit, however great his age, *joyfully suffers himself to be treated like a child; he does not complain;* he does not even think that too little consideration is shown him: and *if he is under obedience in the religious life, he is well satisfied that his Superior shall see all his letters, and send or retain them as he pleases:* and though he may have preached in the most celebrated pulpits with the general applause, not only of the people, but even of princes, he is not reluctant to be humbled: far from that, he makes abasement his delight, and reposes on it as in his centre, ever as passionately desirous of contempt, as worldly men are of honour and of the highest dignities. When a soul is thoroughly established in this disposition, not by a mere yielding, but by a generous and efficacious love of humiliation, she may be said to know what is meant by true humility: and if she has not yet learned to practise it in full perfection, to have at least the thought and desire of doing so.—Surin, pp. 208, 209.

Persuade a man that it is the perfection of self-sacrifice and humility to take pleasure in being treated as a child, and in having his letters opened and pried into, and sent or retained at the caprice of another*—and you make him fit for any purpose to which a total negation of self-respect is a qualification. And meantime his pride and ambition are soothed by the assurance, that in an order where talents and discretion are certain to find their level,

* Indeed this is one of the inquiries made of candidates for the order of Jesuits, whether they are willing to subject their letters to this scrutiny and control, and is an important part of that system of everlasting espionage by which the power of the General is maintained, and by which he contrives to keep together a society where no man can trust another. In the fourth chapter of the examination of candidates is the following:—"Cum autem communicatio, quæ cum amicis, et sanguine junctis verbo aut scripto fit, potius ad quietis perturbationem, quàm ad eorum qui spiritui vacant profectum, præsertim in initiis, facere soleat: Interrogentur, num contenti sint cum hujusmodi non communicare, nec literas accipere, nec scribere; nisi aliquâ occasione Superiori aliter videretur: Et quamdiu Domi fuerint, num contenti sint, ut videantur litteræ omnes, et quæ ipsis scribentur, et quas ipsi aliis scribent; ei, cui hujusmodi munus commissum est, curâ relictâ, ut eas det, vel non det, quemadmodum in Domino Nostro magis expedire judicabit."—Examen. cap. iv. 6. And in like manner, in one of the Declarations on the Constitutions, the following rule is given: "Si aliquis ex iis qui Domi sunt, cuiquam scriberet, non nisi obtentâ facultate, litteris ei ostensis quem Superior destinaverit, id faciet. Si ad eumdem litteræ mitterentur, ei primo reddentur, qui a Superiore fuerit constitutus; qui eas lectas reddet, aut non reddet illi, ad quem sunt destinatæ, prout in Domino expedire ad melius ipsius bonum, et Dei gloriam existimabit."—Part iii. cap i. Declar. B. In a society whose deeds will not bear the light of day, such precautions may be necessary enough. But certainly, it is not a little wonderful to see a state of things where mutual distrust, hatred, suspicion, and deception must inevitably prevail, held up to us by Dr. Pusey, as the beau ideal of Christian simplicity and humility.

he will be employed in the post for which he is best suited. Clothed in the language of piety, Dr. Pusey expresses this idea thus—

With this a man is capable of filling all offices, of acquitting himself well of all sorts of employment; and *God can entrust His gifts to him without risk.*—Ibid.

But, indeed, he makes no concealment of the connexion of this notion with Jesuitism. The following will perhaps be read with surprise, by those who recollect that Dr. Pusey still wishes it to be thought that he is a member of our communion. I shall again beg my reader to bear in mind, that Dr. Pusey is now in the habit of using (as in this passage) the words,—St. Ignatius,—to signify Ignatius Loyola, the founder of the Jesuits.

For this cause the Saints have so highly praised humility, and St. Ignatius, among others, calls the love of contempt a most valuable step in the spiritual life. He often recommended it to his first companions, and some of them, touched by his lessons, became eminent in that virtue. It is related in the History of the Company of Jesus, that Father James Laynez, the most learned Jesuit of his time, and a famous preacher, having been made Provincial of Italy, complained to his General, St. Ignatius, that he called all the best labourers of his province to Rome, and that for want of their assistance the colleges were ill provided. The holy man replied wisely, that it was right to prefer the common to private good, and that it was more important to religion that Rome should be provided with fit persons than the other towns. But Laynez, seeing that the General still persisted in taking away many of his evangelic labourers, thought it right to represent to him once more the inconvenience that this caused him. Then

St. Ignatius could not refrain from testifying to him by letter his displeasure, that though he had sufficiently explained to him why he did so, he still continued his complaints, and thereby *showed less obedience than he ought.* Send me word, added he, if, on examination, you do not think that you have done amiss; and in case you find yourself guilty, let me know to what penance you condemn yourself. The reply of Laynez was a manifest proof of his profound humility, and his letter is preserved word for word in the history. He begins by thanking St. Ignatius for his goodness in warning him of his fault; then humbly acknowledging himself guilty, he asks his pardon for the trouble which he has caused him by his importunity; him, whom he honours as the father of his soul, and to whom he owes the utmost respect: and to the Saint's desire that he would inform him of what punishment he thought himself worthy for his want of obedience, he replies, that whatever he is pleased to order him, will be that which he will most willingly accept; but that since he must impose one on himself, the least of which he thinks himself worthy, is *to be deposed from his office, forbidden to study, and deprived of all books except his Breviary, reduced for his whole life to teach grammar to little children; in a word, to be regarded as filth. He adds to all this many other penances, as fasts and scourgings;* and to this he voluntarily condemns himself for a fault which others would have judged so slight, as hardly to believe it a real fault. But *because he has been blamed for it by his Superior*, he returns unto himself, and accuses himself with a humility which cannot be too much admired in a man of extraordinary merit, a man whom the Supreme Pontiff had chosen to be his preacher, whom he had sent to Trent to assist at the Council as his theologian, and who at length succeeded St. Ignatius in the office of General.—Surin, pp. 210, 211.

Whether this be not something like what the

Meditators would call a "devout invention," I need not stop to inquire now—but the principle which the story is intended to inculcate,—that such an extravagant punishment was deserved by a man high in office, for no other reason but because he had ventured,—not to disobey, (for he never dreamt of that, it seems,)—but to exercise his reason in considering the interests of the Society, so far as to make a representation to his superior,—is as complete an exposition of the utter prostration of mind and conscience which Dr. Pusey and his new guides call humility, as it is possible to conceive. This abject submission—and the willingness to take pleasure in being insulted, misunderstood, and misrepresented, while obeying orders, and advancing the power of the society, these are the first requisites for a Jesuit; and so Dr. Pusey proceeds to inform us,—

> This is the Divine virtue, which should be regarded as the immediate foundation of all graces and all spiritual gifts. Therefore St. Ignatius, *in his instructions for the examination of those who feel themselves called to enter the Company, directs that it shall be particularly inquired of them, whether they have humility enough to love and desire insults, calumnies, and outrages, as much as worldly people love and desire honours and dignities.*—Ibid. p. 211.

Nay, to make the sacrifice more complete, the Jesuit must be detached from all affection, all friendship, all love for his fellow-Christians. With two specimens of this teaching from this work of Dr. Pusey's, I shall bring the present inquiry to a conclu-

sion. In the former of these passages, the maxim of the Jesuits, that everything is to be done, and every person valued, only with a view to what they technically call the greater glory of God,—though not very distinctly expressed, will be readily detected by any one acquainted with the system.

2. There is a second way of forsaking all, when we not only abandon all that we have, and deprive ourselves of it, but when *we feel no attachment to anything*, and can say without deceiving ourselves, that we love God Alone, and wish only to see His will done. A man, for example, who has this disposition, though he likes his place of abode, may say with boldness and sincerity, that he is ready to go wherever he is sent, as soon as he knows God's will respecting it; he may say, also, that whatever pleasure he finds in the conversation of those with whom he has long lived and been acquainted, *he has no difficulty in renouncing it.*

For *if he still feels a strong unwillingness to quit them, though resolved to do so*, he may believe that *he has a desire to do well;* but *this natural inclination to live with our friends, and this difficulty in leaving them, are a sign that he has not yet acquired the true spirit of interior destitution, and that his heart is not detached from all;* for if this were the case, he would be equally satisfied with every place, and *with all sorts of persons:* he would avoid all engagements and reject everything which might diminish his freedom. For, to be wholly free, we must love no good, no employment, nor *even any man soever, except with a view to the greater service of God.* "What thing more quiet than the single eye?" says our author, "and what more free than he that desireth nothing on earth?" B. iii. c. 31. Can one who has not attained this perfect liberty, think himself in a state to enjoy the Presence of God, while the least mote is capable of troubling the eye, and hindering

it from beholding its Object? Here is matter to occupy a man who aspires to eternal happiness. Let him often examine himself, that if he discovers any too human affection, *any attachment, however slight, binding him to creatures, he may quickly rid himself of it*, for otherwise his work will never be ended.—Ibid. pp. 16, 17.

So that although the unfortunate victim of this fearful system of iniquity, be resolved to give up his friends, whenever the caprice of his superior, or the interests of the society demand the sacrifice,—yet if he feels any strong unwillingness—any difficulty in renouncing their society and conversation—he has indeed a desire to do well, but has not yet acquired the true spirit of interior destitution. *He is not free*, in the Jesuit sense of the term—he is not a living corpse—a walking staff—without will, or wish, unresisting in the hand of his superior,—if he still retains the slightest love for any human being whatever, except with a view to the interest of the Jesuit order:—for that, as every tyro knows, is what is meant by the phrase Dr. Pusey has rendered, "the greater service of God."* If some particles of humanity—some love to father, brother, friend—some unselfish disinterested charity,—still linger in his bosom—"any attachment, however slight, binding him to creatures,"—he must only rid himself of it as quickly as he may.

* "Du plùs grand service de Dieu," are Surin's words. In the Constitutions of the Jesuits the phrases, "ad majus servitium Dei,"—"ad majus Dei obsequium," and "ad majorem Dei gloriam,"—appear to be used as equivalent.

The second passage is in a similar strain. It is as follows:—

2. The second thing, in regard of which we have need to overcome ourselves much, is freedom of heart; for as nothing helps us more to attain holiness and perfection than an entire detachment from created things, so we must spare no pains to acquire it. Suppose the case then of a person who is bound by attachment or interest to some other individual. What must he do? *His first care must* be to break his bonds, to renounce every too earthly affection, and *to arrive at* AS GREAT AN INDIFFERENCE FOR THE BELOVED OBJECT AS FOR ONE UNKNOWN. And this must not be long delayed, for the smallest delay is always a hindrance to perfect union with God.

You may, perhaps, have received a present which is very pleasing to you; you feel that your heart clings to it, and that it would give you much pain to part with it, *if it were only on account of the person who gave it, and whose remembrance you wish to preserve. Renounce it instantly, if you are wise,* and if you have any remains of zeal for your spiritual progress. *If thine eye offend thee, pluck it out,* said the Saviour. This is *for you* a cause of offence; banish from your heart all that may hinder its liberty.

Saint Francis once felt some slight satisfaction in composing a little work; the idea of it returned upon his mind during his prayers; he rose immediately and burned it. Those who desire true freedom of heart should imitate this example; and the more diligent they are IN CASTING OFF ALL NATURAL FEELINGS, the greater progress they will make towards perfection. This gives the poor a singular advantage in uniting themselves to God. *There is nothing in which we should labour harder than in breaking these sort of attachments; for God cannot permit that a heart which desires to be His, should divide its affections between Him and His creatures.* An imperfection proceeding from weakness alone, a sudden movement of im-

patience or self-love, does not separate us from Him in such a degree as *a voluntary attachment to any created thing whatever*.—Surin, pp. 65, 66.

When we know, for what horrible purposes these maxims have been framed, and how it is by thus calling good evil, and light darkness, and by branding in this manner the holiest and purest charities of our nature and our religion, as if they were displeasing to God and dangerous to our salvation,—that it is, by such arts as these, innocent and susceptible young persons have been left with broken hearts and disordered understandings, merely because they stood in the way of a wicked and anti-christian ambition, or because it seemed, that by extracting everything that was lovely and generous and unearthly from their hearts, and compelling them to *cast off all natural* feelings,* they might be

* To be without natural affection has not usually been considered a mark of sanctity by divines of our church. The Jesuits teach their young disciples, that they not only should forsake and forget their parents, relations, and friends, but that, in order to form the habit of thought, they should accustom themselves to say, that they *had* parents or brothers, and not that they *have* them. So in one of the Declarations (the authentic Commentaries, which bind the members of the society as much as the text of their Institute,) I find the following:—"Ut loquendi modus, sentiendi modum juvet, sanctum est consilium ut assuescant non dicere, *quod parentes vel fratres habeant*, sed quod *habebant*, &c., præ se ferendo se id non habere, quod, ut Christum omnium rerum loco habeant, reliquerunt. Hoc tamen illis magis est observandum, qui majori in periculo versari videntur, ut ab aliquo naturali amore perturbentur; cujusmodi, ut plurimum, Novitii esse solent." (Examen. cap. iv. Declar. C.) Thus also, making void the law of God by their traditions, they require the novices, to promise that,

reduced to that state of living mechanism which would best fit them to be the blind and passive and unresisting instruments of artful and intriguing selfishness—when we know this—when all mankind knows it—when the common sense and good feeling of Christendom have made the name of Jesuit, in every language in Europe, the symbol for everything which is the reverse of truth and charity, it does seem a fearful and a most humiliating conclusion to the movement which has been so long distracting our church, that a clergyman holding a dignified station, in a protestant church and a protestant university, should thus avow himself the advocate of such a system, and devote himself

whenever they are required by the superior to put their vow of poverty into effect, they shall dispose of their property by giving it to the poor, (by which they understand their own society,) and not to their relations, "that they may the more perfectly follow the Evangelical Counsel which does not say, give to thy relations, but to the poor; and that they may exhibit a better example to all, of casting off inordinate affection to their parents, and of avoiding the inconveniencies of an inordinate distribution which proceeds from such love: and that by closing beforehand the avenue of recurring to parents and relations, and to a useless memory of themselves, they may more firmly and steadily persevere in their vocation. "Pauperibus (ut dictum sit) dispensare debent, ut consilium Evangelicum, quod non dicit, da consanguineis, sed pauperibus, perfectius sequantur, et ut melius exemplum omnibus exhibeant, inordinatum erga parentes affectum exuendi, et incommoda inordinatæ distributionis, quæ a dicto amore procedit, declinandi; atque ut ad parentes et consanguineis recurrendi, et ad inutilem ipsorum memoriam aditu præcluso, firmius et stabilius in suâ vocatione perseverent." Exam. cap. iv. § 2. And yet these men profess Christianity, and this is the system of piety and morals which Dr. Pusey is labouring to propagate in the English Church.

to the most unenviable employment of endeavouring to propagate it amongst us. At all events, the public are fully warned. Whatever attachment Dr. Pusey may profess to our communion, everything which he now gives to the world, whether original or adapted, demonstrates that the purpose he has at heart is the Romanizing of the English church, and that he has no objection to be known as a partizan of the Jesuits, and an advocate of their principles and system.

APPENDIX.

The following letters were addressed to the Editor of the British Magazine, and appeared in the October and November numbers, 1845. I have reprinted them here with the observations I then felt it necessary to make upon them, without any alteration. I have no idea of the name of the author.

LETTER I.

Sir,—In the series of papers, entitled "Modern Hagiology," now in course of publication in the British Magazine, you have censured, with a vehemence which has seldom been exceeded even in these days, certain writers whose sentiments displease you. St. Bonaventure and his translator, Mr. Oakeley, have received, in company with many others, a considerable portion of your very animated reproaches. The imaginary dialogues attributed by the former to holy persons, and justified by the latter, you have not scrupled to describe in such terms as I had rather not repeat, and am anxious to forget. Permit me, however, to inquire, whether you are prepared to include in your censures the much more ancient writers whom St. Bonaventure and Mr.

Oakeley have but imitated? In the treatise "*In sanctum Pascha*," attributed to no less a person than *St. Athanasius*, and contained in the second volume of the works of that father, page 675, ed. Paris, 1627, you will find a long address from our Saviour to S. Thomas, which is purely imaginary. In the Homily upon S. Mary and S. Joseph, in the same volume, similar dialogues may be found. And I need not inform one who is doubtless familiar with such records of antiquity, that very many such examples are to be met with, even in the very earliest Christian writings.

Would it not, then, be more prudent, as well as more religious, to reserve all such terms as "*blasphemy*," and the like, which are now every month scattered so thickly up and down the pages of the British Magazine, for offences to which they would be more accurately applied! For my own part, I will confess—and I am not singular in the opinion—that there has been very much of late in your columns—especially whenever the name of our Lord's blessed mother is introduced—which such terrible phrases would much more suitably describe, than the innocent and edifying works which seem almost to have deprived you of ordinary self-possession.

This new style of writing, which I doubt not is very popular, may procure an augmented circulation for your Magazine; but it is very grievously offen-

sive, to use a mild term, to some of your readers, and amongst others, to your obedient servant,

A Country Vicar.*

* The Editor is very happy to insert this letter, and only regrets that it has not a name, because in the present very trying times it is of great importance that the church should know the persons by whom such works as Mr. Oakeley's "Bonaventure" are considered "innocent and edifying." If they really are "country vicars," so much the worse; but whoever they are, they should be *known*.

In reply, the Editor begs to say that he *is* prepared—fully prepared—to include in his censures any writers, ancient or modern, of whom it can be truly said that Bonaventure and Mr. Oakeley "have but imitated them." But to bring in St. Athanasius is rather too much; and there is something in the language of this letter which raises a very painful suspicion of disingenuousness. "The treatise, 'In sanctum Pascha,' *attributed* to no less a person than St. Athanasius." Could not the "Country Vicar" say more than that? Had he no suspicion that the Benedictine editor had branded it as a forgery, and that for nearly an hundred and fifty years it has stood, where Father Montfaucon placed it, among the *spurious* (not even the *doubtful*) writings which had been *falsely* "attributed" to "St. Athanasius." The sermon referred to is the second among three, of which the learned Benedictine says, in the course of a short "Admonitio," prefixed, "tanta hic cum Athanasiano stylo occurrit discrepantia: ut quisquis eum vel primoribus labris adtigerit, hasce illi Homilias abjudicare nihil cunctetur."—Vol. ii. p. 454. Whether Bonaventure and Mr. Oakeley "have but imitated" the writer of this homily, whoever he might be, is a matter of little consequence in itself; but it is a sad thing to add, that whoever takes the trouble to look at the passage will see how very unfairly, and even absurdly, it is alleged as

LETTER II.

Sir,—You have yourself sufficiently dissuaded me from complying with your invitation to divulge my "name."* To be "known and marked," according

giving colour to such matter as has been censured in this Magazine, and how little it would help the modern Bonaventure school, even if it could be truly "attributed to no less a person than St. Athanasius."

With regard to the other homily, the Editor, though aware that more than one of the *spurious* works "attributed" to St. Athanasius may be described as "upon S. Joseph and S. Mary," and would furnish offensive matter too like that which is now in question, is not aware that any homily bears that title, and the late period of the month at which the "Country Vicar's" letter arrived, does not permit leisure for much inquiry. For the present, therefore, he will merely say, that whatever homily may be meant, if the "Country Vicar" will translate all the dialogue, or part of it, into English, with his name in testimony of its accuracy and of his approval, the Editor will be extremely glad to find a place for it in the Magazine. If not, he will be glad to receive some more exact reference. Will the Country Vicar have the goodness to state, at the same time, what he means by saying, that "very many such examples are to be met with in the very earliest Christian writings," and to name the writings he refers to. The time for delicacy and forbearance has long gone by. Old sophistry, lying legends, forged writings, and all the worst things of the worst defenders of the worst times and practices of irreligious popery are being palmed upon the church with pernicious zeal and industry. Men must be known and marked, and those who are honest will not shrink from it.

* [No invitation whatever was given to the Country Vicar to divulge his name: but an offer was made to in-

to the present fashion of the British Magazine, is a distinction which one may well decline. And, though it would be an honour rather than a reproach to be calumniated as a profane person and a blasphemer, in company with such men as St. Bonaventure among the departed, and Dr. Pusey and Mr. Oakeley among the living servants of God, I sincerely confess myself unworthy to intrude into a participation of their privileges, or to share the reproaches which they know how to bear meekly now, and which will be fully recompensed to them hereafter.

I may add, that common men, like myself, are not so well able to endure the terrible invectives and ferocious contumely which they have provoked.

sert a translation of part of a certain document which he had referred to, on the condition of his giving "his name in testimony of its accuracy and of his approval." Otherwise, he was requested to give "some more exact reference" to it: but even this the Country Vicar has not yet done. Neither has he explained, as he was requested, what he meant by saying, in his first letter, "that very many such examples are to be met with, *even in the very earliest* Christian writings." The Editor has no occasion to know the Country Vicar's name. If people choose to address anonymous letters to him, they have no reason to complain of being dealt with as anonymous writers. And any one who has had to edit periodical publications knows well, how little anonymous writers are to be relied on, and how convenient, on several accounts, it often is to an editor to have no means of ascertaining the name of an anonymous correspondent.—Ed. B. M.]

We have not the secret and ennobling consciousness which belongs to them, of a life purely devoted to God, and aided by the gracious inspirations of His Spirit. The weapons which are harmless indeed when directed against such tried soldiers of the Cross, might easily wound us who have not yet "proved" our armour.

Besides, you have already admonished me of the treatment, which, if I continue this controversy, I may expect at your hands. My citation from the pseudo Athanasius (as it would have been more exact* to style him) you pronounce, off-hand, to be "disingenuous,"—though my own conscience acquits me of any bad faith in the use which I made of his name; and you even intimate a kind of doubt, with

* [What does the Country Vicar mean by saying it would have been "*more exact*" to have styled the writer of the homily "In sanctum Pascha,"—"the pseudo Athanasius,"—instead of citing it, as he did, as a treatise, "attributed to no less a person than St. Athanasius, and contained in the second volume of the works of this father"? *Exactness* has nothing to do with the question. Either he knew that it was a notoriously spurious work, or he did not—if he did, it was disingenuous to cite it as he did. If he did not know it, it is disingenuous to avoid an acknowledgment of ignorance now, as if he had only been blamed for want of exactness. But is it *exact* to call the author the pseudo Athanasius? What proof is there that he attempted to palm off his homily as a work of Athanasius? Others may have blundered, or been dishonest—but that would not make *him* the pseudo Athanasius.—Ed. B. M.]

the lamentable want of charity and good taste which marks your dealings with those who displease you, whether I have correctly designated myself in the subscription to my former letter. You could not, therefore, be surprised, if I chose to retreat at once before such an antagonist, and preferred rather to yield you a cheap victory, than to expose myself to such unusual discourtesies in contesting it with you.

Yet I will say a few words, at your invitation, just to suggest to your readers the kind of defence of which the writers you condemn appear to be capable: though the materials for such defence are so varied and abundant, that even a tolerably adequate selection from them would require rather a volume than a letter.

Your last number will supply me with a sufficient testimony that the abuse which it levels at Dr. Pusey might as justly be directed against some of the greatest names in the Christian church. At page 347 you ask, with reference to an expression of Avrillon upon the washing of the disciples' feet, "Where did Dr. Pusey learn that the Lord was '*kneeling?*'" I suppose, from common sense;* because it is not very easy to wash a man's *feet*,

* [Certainly the most surprising point in the letter. It is a new thing with writers of this school to admit an appeal to common sense. The Country Vicar had better be cautious, lest he should find himself sneered at by his friends.—Ed. B. M.]

even when reclining upon a couch, in any other posture. But let me ask you, in turn, Where did they learn it, who lived a thousand years before Avrillon or his translator was born? Where did St. Cyprian, or whoever was the author of the treatise *De Ablutione Pedum*, learn it? It was no profaneness in his judgment to describe that mystical washing as performed "*genibus flexis*,"[1] though the Scripture does not expressly say so. Where did Bishop Jeremy Taylor learn* that "He chose to wash their feet rather than their head, *that he might have the opportunity of a more humble posture*"?[2] which is surely a much more gratuitous addition to the inspired narrative than that which

[1] "Ad genua Petri, lavaturus pedes ejus, ipse genibus flexis Dominus servo consummatæ humilitatis obtulit famulatum." Inter "Opuscul. vulgo adscripta Sancto Cypriano," p. cxvii. Ed. Baluz.

* [Bishop Taylor does not give this as anything "probable," or "likely," or as anything reasoned or concluded from the text—much less as a pious imagining, or reverent supplying of his own. He gives it (as is his manner) on the authority of Rupert, whom he quotes. Whether he has correctly translated the words of Rupert, 'gestus humilitatis," "a more humble posture," must be left to the consideration of the reader. Mr. Oakeley says: "The master of humility *stands* bending down at the feet of a fisherman, or *on his knees* before them while they sit down." So that the argument from *common sense* seems to have escaped *him*.—Ed. B. M.]

[2] Life of Christ, p. 278; Works, vol. iii. Ed. Heber.

has provoked your question. And where did the ancient commentators learn all those particulars of that solemn scene which they have ventured to imagine in their writings? Where did Theophylact learn, that none of the disciples rose, but only Christ—ἐκείνων ἀναπανομένων—and that Judas *probably* was washed first?* Which of the evangelists told him that "none of the other disciples would have presumed—ηὐθαδειάσατο—to be washed before Peter"?[3] Or where did any one *read* that "Perhaps He only washed Peter, James, and John"?[4] And who told Origen, that He began with Judas first?[5] or S. Chrysostom, that "it is *probable* that

* [To which the Country Vicar may add—Where did Bishop Taylor (or rather Nonnus, whom he quotes) learn the very reverse—that he washed the feet of his disciples, "beginning at the first, St. Peter, until he came to Judas, the traitor?" To such questions there is but one answer—wherever he learnt it, he did not learn it in the Bible: and, if the Country Vicar does not think this a satisfactory answer, one can only be sorry that there is no better to be had.—Ed. B. M.]

[3] In loco, pp. 751, 752. Ed. Paris: 1631.

[4] Poli Synopsis, in loco. [The Country Vicar may as well ask, also, where did another, whom he may likewise quote as "Poli Synopsis, in loco," learn the very opposite, and (if the text have any authority) seemingly with better reason, "Omnes uno Juda excepto." Mr. Oakeley says, He washes, dries, and kisses the feet *of them all*.—Ed. B. M.]

[5] Comment. in Joan. tom. ii. p. 382. Rothomag. 1668.

the traitor, being presumptuous, lay down even before the chief" of the apostles?[6]

Again; you put into Italics the words of Avrillon, "Jesus *proceeded even to threats*" with St. Peter, as if your readers ought to see in them some obvious extravagance and impropriety. Yet St. Chrysostom says the Apostle submitted "when he *threatened*," ἐπειδὴ ἠπείλησεν:[7] and Theophylact, "when he heard this terrible *threat*," ὡς οὖν ἤκουσε Πέτρος ταύτην τὴν φοβερὰν ἀπειλὴν:[8] and St. Cyril, that he feared μείζονα καὶ χαλεπωτέραν ζημίαν:[9] and St. Augustine, that "the Saviour *terrified* him;[10] and even certain English protestant annotators, "either *terrified with the threatening*, or now better understanding," &c.[11] It is evident, therefore, that your ridiculously misplaced indignation must be transferred from Avrillon and Dr. Pusey, to innumerable writers of all sorts of views, and—as I could show if it were worth the pains—of almost all ages.

[6] In cap. 13 Joan. Hom. 69. I take this passage from my note-book, but have not the original at hand to verify it.

[7] Ibid. [8] Ubi supra, p. 753.

[9] Cyril. Alex. in Joan. lib. ix. tom. iv. p. 723. Lutet. 1638.

[10] "Tum Salvator ægrum reluctantem de ipsius salutis periculo exterrens, inquit," &c. In loc. tom. ix. p. 162. Paris, 1586.

[11] "Annotations on the Old and New Testaments by certain learned Divines thereunto appointed." 1651.

But suppose that no one before Avrillon had ever conceived the notion, that the posture of *kneeling* was that in which our Lord washed the feet of his disciples, or noticed any of those minute particulars which they deemed it no irreverence to *imagine;* why might he not religiously say, in the words which you cannot tolerate, "It was *probable,*" or "It was *likely,*" that so and so occurred? In what would such language differ, profane as it may seem to you, from that which good Christians used hundreds of years ago?

Thus St. Chrysostom, speaking of the message of the centurion to our Saviour, "I am not worthy that Thou shouldest come under my roof," observes, "It is *likely* that the centurion, when he wished to have gone, *was stopped by the Jews;* [12] of which the Evangelist, however, says not a word.

Again; "It is *likely,* that after sending his friends, he himself also came and said these things." "It is likely," says St. Chrysostom; but you could have told him he had no business to say it.

Again; upon our Lord's going "into Peter's house," St. Chrysostom asks, "But for what intent did he go into Peter's house? *As it seems to me,* to take food:"[13] and then he *reasons* from the words of the sacred narrative that so it may have been.

[12] In Matth. viii. Hom. 26. Oxford translation, p. 389. (1843.)

[13] Hom. 27, p. 403.

The writings of almost all commentators upon the gospels are full of such remarks.[14] And why may not St. Bonaventure and Avrillon, or their translators, reason from the Scriptures as lawfully as St. Chrysostom and other saints, and say with him, "It is likely," or, "As it seems to me"? The inferences of the one may appear to you more unreasonable, or less naturally deduced from the text, (this is a matter of opinion,) than those of the other, but the *principle* of amplification, and of filling up the outline of the divine story, is the same in each case. And when you affect to doubt whether the writers whom you so fluently reproach, but whom you cannot provoke to take any notice of the harmless calumny, "have any settled belief in the truth of the facts, or the reality of the persons, which they treat," as you think, so irreverently; when you pretend to be distressed at "the spiritual state to which they have reduced themselves," and even wish your readers to doubt whether they—*i. e.*, St. Bonaventure! Dr. Pusey, and the rest, "have any idea of whom it is they are writing in this way!"* one can only wonder, to speak quite plainly,

[14] εἰκὸς ἐστι—this is the phrase which occurs times without number in the old annotators.

* [And yet how can any one think otherwise? If Dr. Pusey will call the Lord "a divine hero," and address him in such language as, "O adorable and divine Anchorite," "O dying God," and address Providence as "Blessed Mother," the Editor does not perceive anything surprising in his asking whether these people have any idea of

first, that such presumptuous trash should ever find its way into print, and then that anybody, even in these days, should read it.

Before I conclude I will select two or three of the very strongest examples of the style of writing which you condemn, in order to show that not only the ideas themselves, but even the terms in which they are expressed, have been anticipated by writers of the most opposite character, some of whom, at least, even you will hardly venture to defame. They shall be such as even Mr. Oakeley himself thought it necessary to mention with a sort of apology in his Introduction to St. Bonaventure's "Life of Christ;" and first, the conception of St. Bonaventure, that the angels who "ministered" to our Lord after his temptation "brought him food."

(1.) Dr. Hammond thought it no offence to say, in his commentary on this passage, "The good angels came and waited on Him, *ministering to His hunger, or bringing Him meat,* as to Elias was done."[15] The protestant annotators quoted above say, "To tender their service and homage unto him,

whom it is they are writing in this way, or any settled belief in the truth of the facts, or the reality of the persons, which they treat in this manner. The Country Vicar, however, cites this as if it were a general censure. Will any clergyman *of any church* undertake to justify the precise language it was intended to apply to? One would hope not.—Ed. B. M.]

[15] Paraphrase on S. Matth. iv. 11; Works, vol. iii. p. 20. (1659.)

or to bring Him food." Another more briefly writes, "*Esurienti cibum;*"[16] and Jeremy Taylor, "bringing such things as his necessities required."[17] I purposely omit the comments of more ancient writers.

(2.) Another thought referred to in Mr. Oakeley's Introduction relates to the use made of the *gold* presented by the Magi, of which Holy Scripture says not a word. Of this Jeremy Taylor was not afraid to say, "The gold was a good antidote *against the present indigencies of His poverty.*"[18] And the annotators before cited observe that "God so provided *to furnish and supply Joseph* for his flight with Mary and Jesus into Egypt."*

(3.) Again, it is a crime in St. Bonaventure and the rest, to take "such infinitely indecent liberties," as you style them, with the name of S. Mary, and to attribute to her actions and sayings not recorded in the gospels. Now, in the Aurea Catena of S. Thomas Aquinas, we are told by the pseudo-Chrysostom, that the Magi found her "not covered with

[16] Poli Synopsis, in loco. [17] Life of Christ, p. 187.
[18] Ibid. p. 49.

* [But how will this harmonize with Mr. Oakeley's statement? "She expended the whole, as I judge, in the course of a few days, for the use of the poor"—and he argues that she must have done so, from the poverty of her offering at the Purification. The Country Vicar would do well to adjust this difference.—Ed. B. M.]

a diadem or laying on a golden couch, *but with barely one garment*, not for ornament but for covering"[19]—of which, again, we read not a word in the Evangelists. Immediately after, Rabanus Maurus is quoted as saying, of the same occasion—the epiphany—that "Joseph was absent *by divine command:*" and then he assigns the reason, "that no wrong suspicions might occur to the Gentiles;" a sentiment which you will probably class with the blasphemies &c. of Mr. Oakeley and Dr. Pusey. Perhaps you will put S. Jerome in the same category, who says, that when the blessed Virgin was "found with child," "Inventa est a nullo alis, nisi a Joseph: qui sponsæ uterum tumentem pene jam licentia maritali, et curiosis oculis deprehendit."[20] If Dr. Pusey had written this, or anything like it, it is easy to guess what you would have said. Let me add, as harmonizing exactly with some of the beautiful and holy thoughts of St. Bonaventure, the statements of Jeremy Taylor, that the holy Virgin felt no pain in bringing forth Him who was both her Son and her Saviour, and that, "when it began to be with her after the manner of women, *she humbly bowed her knees, in the posture and guise of worshippers.*"[21] I fear the good bishop will hardly escape your reproaches for this; but we shall see.

[19] In Matt. ii. 10, 11.

[20] Adv. Helvidium, opp. tom. i. p. 133; Antwerp. 1579.

[21] Life of Christ, p. 20.

Again, Theophylact says, (but there is not a wo of it in the Scriptures,) that when S. Elizabeth w. about to bring forth her son, S. Mary, who had bee. staying with her, left her house, *because it was not seemly that she should remain in a place where it was likely there would be a throng of people**—ἀπρεπὲς γὰρ παρθένῳ ἐν τοῖς τοιούτοις ἀναστρέφεσθαι.[22] The same father adds a good many other things about her, which, in St. Bonaventure, would have been very "indecent liberties" indeed.†

(4.) Another notion, which you have exceeded even your usual zeal in reprobating, is, that the angel waited the *assent* of the Virgin Mary to the dispensation in which she was to bear so awful a

* [The Country Vicar should in candour have added, that Mr. Oakeley is at issue with Theophylact on this point. According to his "beautiful and holy thoughts," "when Elizabeth's full time was come, she was happily delivered of a son, whom our Lady received in her arms, and swaddled with becoming care." (Life of Christ, p. 17.) And he adds, that, while Zacharias "was singing" the Benedictus, "our blessed Lady, virgin like, to avoid being gazed on by the men who were present, on account of the ceremony, kept apart in a secret recess of the chamber." (Ib. p. 18.) Surely Mr. Oakeley and Theophylact cannot both be right.—Ed. B. M.]

[22] Comment. in Lucam, p. 310.

† [If they *are* "indecent liberties" in Bonaventure, they are "indecent liberties" in Theophylact also. But still more indecent in persons educated as Dr. Pusey and Mr. Oakeley have been.—Ed. B. M.]

part, and the hypostatic union which was to be accomplished within her. Yet this, again, is at least a thousand years older than Mr. Oakeley. "O beata Maria," says the pseudo-Augustine,—perhaps Fulgentius—"seculum omne captivum *tuum deprecatur assensum*, te apud Deum mundus suæ fidei obsidem fecit. *Noli morari Virgo:* nuncio festinanter responde verbum et suscipe Filium : da fidem, et senti virtutem. 'Ecce, inquit, ancilla Domini, fiat mihi secundum verbum tuum.' Nec mora revertitur nuncius, et virginalem thalamum ingreditur Christas."[23] "*Consensum* exigit Deus," says another more briefly, "quia non decuit eam impregnari *invitam* aut insciam."[24]

But if I were to continue these illustrations, which might be multiplied almost without limit, I should require such a space in your Magazine as I certainly have no desire to claim. And perhaps enough has been said to induce some, at least, of your readers to doubt, whether it is quite safe or salutary to give any hearing to those dreadful calumnies which you now provide monthly for their amusement, and which are directed against men who have been instruments in God's hands to lead thousands to a closer walk with Him, but whom you represent as though they were monsters of pro-

[23] De Annunciatione, Sermo ii. tom. x. p. 413.
[24] Poli Synopsis, In Lucam, cap. i. 38, p. 871.

faneness and irreverence. At all events, they may see that the offences which you impute to them, they share with some of the best men who ever lived; and this, perhaps, may lead to some useful reflections. What you will say yourself to the language of Theophylact and S. Jerome, Hammond, and Jeremy Taylor, we need not inquire. You are "prepared," you say, "fully prepared," to revile either them or any body else whom St. Bonaventure and Mr. Oakeley "have but imitated." I have no doubt you are.*

I will only add, therefore, that whether you continue your present style of writing or not, you will do so without any further remonstrance from your obedient servant,

A Country Vicar.

* [Why does the Country Vicar say—"You are 'prepared,' you say, 'fully prepared,' to revile either them, or anybody else whom St. Bonaventure or Mr. Oakeley 'have but imitated'"? Considerable allowance may be made for one who evidently writes under feelings of great irritation;—but why not adhere to truth? The Editor did not say he was prepared to *revile* any one whatever. He said he was "prepared, fully prepared, to *include in his censures* any writers, ancient or modern, of whom it can be said that Bonaventure and Mr. Oakeley 'have but imitated them.'" This is what the Editor did say, and he repeats it. But he said nothing about being prepared to "*revile*" any one whatever; and that for the best possible reason—because he has no intention of doing so,—and he hopes he has never done anything of the sort on any occasion. And, "to speak quite plainly," he really cannot see what the Country Vicar hopes to gain, either for himself or his

party, by so extraordinary a misrepresentation. But, in truth, his present letter is a tissue of misrepresentation from beginning to end.

What was censured in Dr. Pusey and Mr. Oakeley was not anything bearing the remotest resemblance to the mode in which commentators, ancient or modern, have expressed their opinion as to the probable reasons of actions, or the probable mode of reconciling and harmonizing the different accounts in the Evangelists. Not that this conjectural system of exposition is to be defended. On the contrary, the Editor hesitates not to express his deliberate conviction, that very great injury has been done to the interpretation of Holy Scripture, by indulging in conjectures of this sort; and that nothing has served more effectually to divert the mind, both of commentator and reader, from the lessons which the text, as it stands, is really calculated to teach. Still, this conjectural system of exposition is not what the Editor censured. If the Country Vicar takes the trouble to read over the passages extracted from Dr. Pusey and Mr. Oakeley, he will see that it is not, nor anything resembling it. What was censured,—and it cannot possibly be too strongly reprobated—is the principle these gentlemen have asserted—namely, that they have a right to make additions to the sacred text, and to reverently supply, and piously imagine, what the Author of Revelation has kept concealed: and if any country vicar,—or any clergyman whatever,—thinks such censure "ridiculously misplaced,"—and considers such tampering with the Word of God "innocent and edifying,"—the Editor is truly sorry for it,—for their sakes, and for the church's also;—and he repeats what he said last month—"If they are country vicars, so much the worse; but whoever they are, they should be known."

But besides this false and pernicious principle, several instances were pointed out where Dr. Pusey had contradicted the scripture narrative—and others—where, even in his description of the Lord's passion, he had contra-

dicted himself; and particularly—language was transcribed from his account of the communicating of Judas, of which the Editor stated his belief that it is diametrically opposed to the Article of the Church of England, and he now adds—to the Catholic Faith. This he hopes is not "calumny." But if the Country Vicar will prove that he has mistaken Dr. Pusey, he will be thankful to acknowledge his obligation to him.

But the authorities,—the pseudo Athanasius,—and the pseudo Chrysostom,—and the pseudo Augustine, and the unknown author of the book ignorantly ascribed to St. Cyprian,—and Rabanus Maurus,—and Lucas Brugensis, (not one of "the very earliest Christian writers,") whom the Country Vicar cites as "Poli Synopsis in loco," and seems to take for a Protestant;—what is to be said of this formidable array,—"gorgons, and hydras, and chimeras dire"? Really the answer is very simple. Suppose that a hundred instances could be found similar to every one of the passages censured—and that,—not in apocryphal writings and pseudo fathers—but in bona fide writers of name and character—what on earth could such authorities have to do with the question? We read what the wise and the good have written—in order to weigh, and digest, and discriminate—not for the miserable purpose of raking together their mistakes, and errors, and blemishes, in order to make a show of precedents and justifications for what is wrong and mischievous.

But a word is due to Bishop Taylor. Jeremy Taylor was a great and a good man, and a most able and determined opposer of those Romish errors and novelties with which Dr. Pusey and Mr. Oakeley are now endeavouring to poison the minds of Christians. But he had his weak point,—though it were a brilliant one;—and his weak point,—as a writer,—was a sadly insufficient control over his imagination. It is to be hoped that the Country Vicar will not say that the Editor is *reviling* Bishop Taylor if he ventures to add, that he can never read his Great Exemplar

without regretting that he suffered his irrepressible fancy, and the exuberance of a memory teeming with treasures all but immeasurable, to disfigure the beauties and diminish the worth of a work otherwise, on many accounts, so valuable. In this Bishop Taylor is not to be defended; still less to be imitated:—least of all to be alleged as an authority to silence argument. Nor is the Editor singular in this opinion. And, really, it may be as well to quote one or two passages from an author who wrote more than twenty years ago, and who certainly did not mean to *revile* him. In his Life of Jeremy Taylor, Bishop Heber makes the following remarks:—

"But Taylor was anything rather than a critical inquirer into facts (however strange) of history or philosophy. If such alleged facts suited his purpose, he received them without examination, and retailed them without scruple; and we therefore read, in his works, of such doubtful or incredible examples as that of a single city containing fifteen millions of inhabitants; of the Neapolitan manna, which failed as soon as it was subjected to a tax; and of the monument 'nine furlongs high,' which was erected by Ninus, the Assyrian. Nor in his illustrations, even where they refer to matters of daily observation, or of undoubted truth, is he always attentive to accuracy. 'When men sell a mule,' he tells us, 'they speak of the horse that begat him, not of the ass that bore him.' It is singular that he should forget that, of mules, the ass is always the father. What follows is still more extraordinary; inasmuch as *it shows a forgetfulness of the circumstance of two of the most illustrious events in the Old Testament.* 'We should fight,' says he, 'as Gideon did, with three hundred hardy brave fellows that would stand against all violence, *rather than to make a noise with rams' horns and broken pitchers, like the men at the siege of Jericho.*' Had he thought twice," continues Bishop Heber, "he must have recollected that 'making a noise' was at least one principal part of the service required from

Gideon's troops, and that the 'broken pitchers' were their property alone, and a circumstance of which the narrative of the siege of Jericho affords not the least mention." (Pp. ccc—ccci.) And with regard to the Life of Christ, Bishop Heber in one place says, "he had twice quoted as from Scripture, though without naming the place, a story of 23,000 Assyrians destroyed in one night for fornication, which, I confess, I never met with in Scripture or elsewhere." And in another place he says: "He does not even distinguish between those facts which are recorded by the inspired historians themselves, and those which repose on uncertain tradition, or on the mere presumptions of the ancient fathers; but relates with almost the same apparent faith, the salutation of the angel to the Virgin Mary; the Syrian prayer attributed to Christ at his baptism by St. Philoxenes; and the prostration of the Egyptian idols, when the infant Jesus came into their country." —(p. cxxxi.)

Such is Bishop Heber's representation; and, really, it would be wrong to conceal one's conviction that such a loose method of treating facts and authorities is extremely objectionable. No name can justify it. Undoubtedly, it is a symptom either of want of principle, or of defect of judgment. But however this fault is to be deplored in Bishop Taylor, in him it was but a cloud and a flaw—the more conspicuous from the value and brilliancy of what it blemishes. And, truly, it would be the highest injustice to his memory not to say, that it is a gross injury and unfairness to speak of his Life of Christ as if it bore any resemblance whatever to such productions as Mr. Oakeley's or Dr. Pusey's. Any one that will look at the passages in their adaptations, which have been censured in this Magazine, will see at a glance, that to speak of Bishop Taylor's writing as if it were of the same sort or kind as theirs, is perfectly preposterous and untrue. And if Bishop Taylor were here to give his opinion he would probably have censured such meditations and adaptations, in

the same terms as he has already branded another of Bonaventure's performances, as "intolerable blasphemy." Nay, even Mr. Oakeley, who is willing enough to make use of the sanction of Bishop Taylor's name, and to cite his faults as precedents, is obliged to confess the difference between their schools of meditation, when he says of the Bishop, that "although, for the most part, *he confines himself rigidly* to the inspired text, yet his work gives many proofs of the *great inconvenience*, nay, *absolute impracticability, of such a restriction* in the case of a lively imagination, and affectionate heart like his."* Indeed, even Mr. Isaac Williams himself does not satisfy Mr. Oakeley —for although Mr. Oakeley prefers *his* Harmony of the Passion, on some accounts, to Bishop Taylor's work, it appears to him, he says, "deficient in reverence towards the Mother of God, and that blessed Apostle to whom was consigned the keeping of Christ's flock,"†—language, by the way, which ordinary readers will suppose to border on *teaching* Roman doctrine.

As to noticing everything in the Country Vicar's letter, it will probably be deemed unnecessary. Those who have not yet read the papers on Modern Hagiology, which have so much displeased him, will, it is hoped, do so, and judge for themselves, whether they deserve to be stigmatized as "dreadful calumnies"—"terrible invective" —"ferocious contumely," and "presumptuous trash."— Ed. B. M.]

* Life of Christ, Introd. pp. xxvi. xxvii.
† Ibid. xxvii. xxviii.

THE END.

T. C. Savill, Printer, 4, Chandos-street, Covent-garden.

By the same Author.

SERMONS ON PRACTICAL SUBJECTS,

Octavo, price 7*s.* 6*d.*

THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY

AND THE

ESTABLISHMENT OF CHRISTIANITY.

Two Discourses on Public Occasions;

WITH ILLUSTRATIVE NOTES, AND AN APPENDIX.

Octavo, price 6*s.*

Now Publishing, Octavo, in Monthly Parts, price 1*s., and Half-yearly Volumes, cloth,* 7*s. each,*

PRACTICAL SERMONS,

BY DIGNITARIES AND OTHER CLERGYMEN

OF THE

United Church of England & Ireland.

EDITED BY

THE REV. J. C. CROSTHWAITE, M.A.

RECTOR OF ST. MARY-AT-HILL AND ST. ANDREW HUBBARD, LONDON.

LONDON: JOHN W. PARKER, WEST STRAND.

This book is DUE on the last
date stamped below

OCT 15 1958

LD
URL

DISCHARGE-URL

MAR 21 1979

OCT 07 1988

REC'D LD-URL

SEP 21 1988

3m-6,'50(550)470

AA 000 604 723 7